# Calculational Design of Information Flow Monitors (extended version)

Mounir Assaf
Stevens Institute of Technology

David A. Naumann
Stevens Institute of Technology

arXiv:1605.02778v1 [cs.CR] 9 May 2016

***Abstract*—Fine grained information flow monitoring can in principle address a wide range of security and privacy goals, for example in web applications. But it is very difficult to achieve sound monitoring with acceptable runtime cost and sufficient precision to avoid impractical restrictions on programs and policies. We present a systematic technique for design of monitors that are correct by construction. It encompasses policies with downgrading. The technique is based on abstract interpretation which is a standard basis for static analysis of programs. This should enable integration of a wide range of analysis techniques, enabling more sophisticated engineering of monitors to address the challenges of precision and scaling to widely used programming languages.**

## I. Introduction

Runtime monitoring can serve to test a program's security or to ensure its security by detecting violations. Monitoring is a good fit for access control policies, which are safety properties. A run either does or does not satisfy the policy, and a monitor can be precise in the sense of raising an alert only when the run is poised to violate the policy. Information flow policies are about dependency, e.g., an untrusted (resp. secret) input should not influence a trusted (resp. public) output. Formal definitions of information flow (***IF***) security are "hyperproperties" [25] involving multiple runs. Suppose an observer classified as "low" knows the code, the set of possible secret inputs, and the low input (from which they can deduce the possible runs and low outputs). A policy specifies what can be learned about the secret upon observing a particular low output. Learning means determining a smaller set of possible values of the secret. How is a monitor, acting only on the actual execution, to detect violations of a property defined with respect to all (pairs of) runs? Remarkably, this was shown to be possible [42]. In this paper we show how to design such monitors systematically.

A popular way to monitor dependency is to tag secret data and propagate tags whenever tagged data is involved in computing other data. If an output is not tagged, we might conclude that in all possible runs, the output would have the same value, i.e., nothing has been learned about the secret. The conclusion is wrong, owing to information channels besides data flow. The most pervasive and exploitable such channel is control flow. If some branch condition depends on a secret, the low observer may learn the secret from the absence of an observable action that happens in the other branch.

Owing to the possibility of such *implicit flow*, sound monitors are not in general precise. A simple technique is to raise an alert if a low assignment is attempted in a high branch, yielding false positives in cases like this: **if** $inhi$ **then** $outlo := 0$ **else** $outlo := 0$. Another technique which has been investigated extensively is to rely on static analysis to determine which locations might have been updated in executions that do not follow the same branch as the actual execution. The monitor tags all such locations when the control join point is reached. These techniques provide monitoring that is provably sound with respect to idealized semantics that ignores covert channels like timing (e.g., [9], [15], [42], [52], [56]).

These and related techniques have been investigated and implemented but had quite limited practical impact. One obvious reason is the difficulty of specifying policies with sufficient flexibility to capture security goals without excessive restriction. Another impediment to practical use is that keeping track of possible alternate control paths has high performance cost. Lowering precision to reduce cost can result in intolerably many false positives. It is an active area of research to improve monitors for better performance, better precision, and more subtle policies. (See Section VI for related work.)

Another impediment to practical IF monitoring is that, if enough is at stake to motivate paying the costs of policy specification, performance degradation, and possible false positives, there should be high assurance of correctness. The complexity of monitoring grows with the complexity of the programming language and the monitoring techniques. While there are machine-checked correctness proofs for theoretical models, there are few for practical implementations. The proofs known to us have been done "from scratch", rather than building on and reusing prior results (though of course one can identify common techniques). Such proofs are not easily maintained as the monitored language and platform evolves.

This paper addresses the impediments related to the precision of monitors as well as the complexity of their design and correctness proofs.

For safety properties, the theory of abstract interpretation [29] is well established and widely used to guide and validate the design of static analyses [30]. Like the best theories in engineering, abstract interpretation allows designs to be derived from their specification instead of merely helping to justify them after the fact [27]. Abstract interpretation underlies the static analysis part of some IF monitors [16], [46], but the monitor design and justification remains ad hoc. Abstract interpretation has also been used for static analysis of noninterference [40].

Chudnov et al. [23] suggest that an IF monitor should be viewed as computing an abstract interpretation to account for alternate runs vis-à-vis the monitored run. The key observation is that typical IF policies are 2-safety [25]: a violation has the form of a pair of runs, so the monitored run (*major run*) need only be checked with respect to each alternate (*minor run*) individually. What needs to be checked about the minor run is a safety property, defined in terms of the major run (and thus fully known to the monitor only upon completion of the major run). This view offers a path to more sophisticated monitoring and systematic development of monitors for real world languages and platforms, and modular machine checked correctness proofs. But the paper [23] is devoid of Galois connections or other trappings of abstract interpretation! It offers only a rational reconstruction of an existing monitor for the simple while language, augmented with downgrading and intermediate release policies.

**Contribution: ideal monitor** We reformulate the idea of "tracking set" in Chudnov et al. [23] as a novel variation of the standard notion of collecting semantics [28], which serves as specification for—and basis for deriving—static analyses. We generalize collecting semantics to depend on the major run, in an *ideal monitor* which we prove embodies checking of noninterference for the major execution.

**Contribution: derived monitors** We derive several monitors from the monitoring semantics, using techniques of abstract interpretation to show the monitors are correct by construction. That is, the definitions are obtained by calculation, disentangling routine steps from inventive steps and design choices, inspired by Cousot [27]. We identify two main ways in which a monitor can glean information from the major run and the abstractly interpreted collective minor runs, accounting for existing monitors as well as showing the way to further advances that can be made in precision and efficiency.

A key abstraction used in our monitors is one for relational formulas as in [23], here formulated as a Galois connection. In the cited paper, the derived monitor exhibits ad hoc features that reflect implementation details, e.g., simple agreement relations are represented both by taint tags on variables and by formulas. Here we refrain from dwelling on implementation and instead explore how some existing static analyses can be used in monitoring with little or no change. For example, one of our monitors uses an interval analysis, known to have good performance in practice. Other analyses, like constant propagation could as well be incorporated, as we discuss. As in standard static analysis, the notion of reduced product [26], [29], [35] serves to share information between different analyses, increasing their precision and efficiency.

These first steps are a proof of principle. In the future, solid theoretical underpinnings can enable aggressive engineering of monitors while retaining high assurance.

*Outline:* Sec. II introduces the simple language used to present our ideas, and reviews key notions from abstract interpretation, especially collecting semantics. For commands we choose standard denotational semantics, because it facilitates streamlined notations in what follows. Sec. III presents the *ideal monitor* and shows how extant security policies are defined in terms of this semantics. Sec. IV defines a Galois connection for the lattice of relational formulas. That connection induces a specification of a monitor that approximates the ideal monitor. We sketch the derivation, from that specification, of a generic monitor. Sec. V derives several monitors, by refining the generic monitor to use different abstract interpretations for the minor runs. These include a new purely dynamic monitor as well as improvement on prior monitoring techniques. Sec. VI discusses related work. Sec. VII discusses ideas for monitoring richer languages and for gaining precision by leveraging existing static analyses.

An appendix, providing detailed proofs for all results, can be found in the end of this technical report.

## II. Background

### A. Language syntax and standard semantics

To expose the main ideas it suffices to work with the simple imperative language with integer variables. The only non-standard features are the ***annotation commands***, assert and assume. These use relational formulas as in Chudnov et al. [23], and are explained in due course.

**Program syntax**

$$
\begin{aligned}
e &::= n \mid id \mid e_1 \oplus e_2 \mid b \\
b &::= e_1 < e_2 \mid e_1 = e_2 \mid \neg b \mid b_1 \wedge b_2 \\
c &::= id := e \mid c_1; c_2 \mid \textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2 \mid \textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c \\
&\quad \mid \textbf{skip} \mid \textbf{assume } \Phi \mid \textbf{assert } \Phi \\
\Phi &::= \mathbb{A}e \mid \mathbb{B}b \mid \mathbb{B}b \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}e \quad \text{(basic formulas)} \\
&\quad \mid \Phi, \Phi
\end{aligned}
$$

Expressions are integer-valued. They include constants $n$, variables $id$, binary operators (indicated by $\oplus$), and boolean expressions $b$.

A ***state*** is a mapping from variables $id$ to values $v \in \mathbb{Z}$. For $\sigma \in \mathrm{States}$ we define the denotation $[\![e]\!]\sigma$ of an expression $e$ as usual. For example, $[\![id]\!]\sigma \triangleq \sigma(id)$. Boolean expressions evaluate to either integer 0 or 1, e.g., $[\![\neg b]\!]\sigma$ is 1 if $[\![b]\!]\sigma = 0$. We omit the details, which are standard, and for simplicity we assume that every expression has a value in every state.

We define the set of outcomes $\mathrm{States}_\perp \triangleq \mathrm{States} \cup \{\perp\}$ where $\perp$ is distinct from proper states (representing divergence). We denote by $\preccurlyeq$ the approximation partial order over the flat domain $\mathrm{States}_\perp$, and $\dot{\preccurlyeq}$ its lifting to functions over outcomes. Therefore, the denotation of a command $c$ is a function

$$[\![c]\!] \in \mathrm{States}_\perp \to \mathrm{States}_\perp$$

For background on denotational semantics, see [58].

The clause $[\![c]\!]\perp \triangleq \perp$ indicates that $[\![c]\!]$ is $\perp$-strict for all $c$ and we ignore $\perp$ in the subsequent cases. The annotation commands act like skip. In the clause for if/else, we confuse

1 and 0 with truth and falsity in the metalanguage, to avoid writing $[\![b]\!]\sigma = 1$ etc. Throughout this paper, we denote the least fixpoint of a monotonic function $f \in A \to A$ that is $\sqsubseteq$-greater than $x \in A$ by $\mathrm{lfp}_x^{\sqsubseteq} f$.

**Standard semantics of commands** $[\![-]\!]$

$$[\![c]\!]\bot \triangleq \bot \qquad [\![id := e]\!]\sigma \triangleq \sigma[id \mapsto [\![e]\!]\sigma]$$

$$[\![c_1; c_2]\!]\sigma \triangleq [\![c_2]\!] \circ [\![c_1]\!]\sigma$$

$$[\![\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2]\!]\sigma \triangleq \begin{cases} [\![c_1]\!]\sigma & \text{if } [\![b]\!]\sigma \\ [\![c_2]\!]\sigma & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \end{cases}$$

$$[\![\textbf{assume } \Phi]\!]\sigma \triangleq \sigma \qquad [\![\textbf{assert } \Phi]\!]\sigma \triangleq \sigma \qquad [\![\textbf{skip}]\!]\sigma \triangleq \sigma$$

$$[\![\textbf{while } b \ c]\!]\sigma \triangleq (\mathrm{lfp}^{\dot{\leq}}_{(\lambda\sigma.\bot)} \mathcal{F})(\sigma)$$
$$\text{where } \mathcal{F}(w)(\rho) \triangleq \begin{cases} \rho & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\rho \\ w \circ [\![c]\!]\rho & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

### B. Relational formulas

Relational formulas relate two states. The ***agreement*** formula $\mathbb{A}x$ says the two states have the same value for $x$. In relational logics, initial and final agreements indicate which variables are "low", as in the low-indistinguishability relations used to define noninterference [1]. In this paper we internalize specifications using annotation commands as in [23]. Given a command $c$, consider the command

$$\textbf{assume } \mathbb{A}x, \mathbb{A}y; \ c; \ \textbf{assert } \mathbb{A}z \tag{1}$$

This expresses that the final value of $z$ may depend on the initial values of $x$ and $y$ but not on other variables. If, from two states that agree on $x$ and $y$, executions of $c$ lead to different values of $z$, the assertion will fail.

Assumptions at intermediate points in the program serve to specify downgrading, similar to explicit code annotations in some work [21], [48], [49]. Although we do not model intermediate output as such, one may model an output channel as a variable, say $out$; the policy that it is low can be specified by asserting agreement over what is assigned to $out$.

Relational formulas also feature a "holds in both" operator: Two states $\sigma$ and $\tau$ satisfy $\mathbb{B}b$ iff. they both evaluate the conditional expression $b$ to 1. The third basic form is conditional agreement [2], [23], $\mathbb{B}b \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}e$, which can be used to encode multilevel security policies as well as to encode conditional downgrading (e.g., [11], [20]).

**Semantics of relational formulas** $\sigma \mid \tau \models \Phi$

$$\sigma \mid \tau \models \mathbb{A}e \text{ iff. } [\![e]\!]\sigma = [\![e]\!]\tau \qquad \sigma \mid \tau \models \mathbb{B}b \text{ iff. } [\![b]\!]\sigma \text{ and } [\![b]\!]\tau$$

$$\sigma \mid \tau \models (\mathbb{B}b \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}e) \text{ iff. } \sigma \mid \tau \models \mathbb{B}b \text{ implies } \sigma \mid \tau \models \mathbb{A}e$$

$$\sigma \mid \tau \models \Phi, \Psi \text{ iff. } \sigma \mid \tau \models \Phi \text{ and } \sigma \mid \tau \models \Psi$$

Relational formulas are closed under conjunction, written $\Phi, \Psi$ as a reminder that sometimes we abuse notation and treat a relational formula as a set of basic formulas.

### C. Collecting semantics and abstract interpretation

Usually, abstract interpretation-based static analyses introduce a collecting semantics (also known as a static semantics [28, Section 4]) aimed at formalizing the possible behaviours of a program wrt. a property of interest. This serves as a starting point for the derivation of sound approximate representations of program behaviours. The collecting semantics lifts the standard semantics to apply to arbitrary sets of proper states, ignoring the $\bot$ outcome that indicates divergence because — like most work on information flow monitoring — we aim for termination-insensitive security [19].

$$\{\!|c|\!\} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{States}) \to \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{States})$$
$$\{\!|c|\!\}\Sigma \triangleq \{[\![c]\!]\sigma \mid \sigma \in \Sigma \text{ and } [\![c]\!]\sigma \neq \bot\} \tag{2}$$

The powerset $\mathcal{P}(\mathrm{States})$, with set inclusion as a partial order, is a complete lattice. The collecting semantics can be given a direct definition that makes explicit the fixpoint computation over a set of states, rather than relying on the underlying fixpoint of the functional $\mathcal{F}$ used in the standard semantics of **while**.

**Collecting semantics** $\{\!|-|\!\}$ $\quad \mathrm{grd}^b$

$$\mathrm{grd}^b(\Sigma) \triangleq \{\tau \in \Sigma \mid [\![b]\!]\tau = \mathit{true}\}$$

$$\{\!|id := e|\!\}\Sigma = \{\sigma[id \mapsto [\![e]\!]\sigma] \mid \sigma \in \Sigma\}$$

$$\{\!|c_1; c_2|\!\}\Sigma = \{\!|c_2|\!\} \circ \{\!|c_1|\!\}\Sigma$$

$$\{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2|\!\}\Sigma = \{\!|c_1|\!\} \circ \mathrm{grd}^b(\Sigma) \cup \{\!|c_2|\!\} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}(\Sigma)$$

$$\{\!|\textbf{assume } \Phi|\!\}\Sigma = \Sigma \qquad \{\!|\textbf{assert } \Phi|\!\}\Sigma = \Sigma \qquad \{\!|\textbf{skip}|\!\}\Sigma = \Sigma$$

$$\{\!|\textbf{while } b \ c|\!\}\Sigma = \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(\mathrm{lfp}^{\subseteq}_{\Sigma} \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!\}\right)$$

**Lemma 1 .** The displayed equations define the same semantics as Equation (2).

The proof is by structural induction on commands.[1]

A ***Galois connection***, written $(C; \leq) \underset{\alpha}{\overset{\gamma}{\leftrightarrows}} (A; \sqsubseteq)$, comprises partially ordered sets with monotonic functions $\alpha, \gamma$ such that $\alpha(x) \sqsubseteq y$ iff. $x \leq \gamma(y)$ for all $x \in C, y \in A$.

In case $C$ is $\mathcal{P}(\mathrm{States})$ and $A$ is some lattice of abstract states, a ***sound approximation*** for command $c$ is $t \in A \to A$ such that the following holds (writing $\dot{\sqsubseteq}$ for the pointwise lift of $\sqsubseteq$):

$$\alpha \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma \ \dot{\sqsubseteq}\ t \tag{3}$$

[1] While this formulation of the collecting semantics "is sometimes taken as *standard* in abstract interpretation works" [22], Cachera and Pichardie [22] provide the first precise proof relating it to a small-step operational semantics.

The ***best abstract transformer*** for $c$ is $\alpha \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma$. It is not computable, in general, but it serves to specify the abstract interpretation $t$. The idea is to derive an abstract semantics $\{\!|-|\!\}^\sharp$ so that, for all $c$, $\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp$ is a sound approximation of $c$ and can be implemented efficiently.

## III. Ideal Monitor

We introduce a concrete monitoring semantics which serves as basis to define the security property by interpreting annotation commands with respect to both the actual execution (***major run***) and all possible alternatives (***minor runs***). Readers familiar with Chudnov et al. [23] may see this as a principled account of their notion of "tracking set", adapted to denotational semantics. Sections IV and V derive monitors as abstract interpretations of this ideal monitor.

The main difference between the collecting semantics and the ideal monitor is that the ideal monitor is parametrised by the current state $\sigma$ of the major run – we call this a ***major state***. The ideal monitor is responsible for interpreting annotation commands in order to track and verify the relational formulas satisfied by all minor states $\tau$ in the tracking set $\Sigma$, wrt. the major state $\sigma$.

The ideal monitor also has to signal security violations due to assertion failures. We use the term ***fault***, denoted by $\lightning$. We define $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States}) \triangleq \mathcal{P}(\text{States}) \cup \{\lightning\}$. Therefore, the ideal monitor

$$(\!|c|\!) \in \text{States}_\bot \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$$

is applied to the initial major state and maps an input tracking set $\Sigma$ to an output set $\Sigma'$ or fault $\lightning$. We also introduce only one rule ($(\!|c|\!)_\sigma \lightning \triangleq \lightning$) to mean that the ideal monitor maps fault to fault.

In order to use the framework of abstract interpretation, we provide the set $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$ with a lattice structure. To this end, we lift set inclusion, the natural partial order over the powerset $\mathcal{P}(\text{States})$, to the set $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$. Therefore, we let $\lightning$ be the top element of the set $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$ and we denote by $\sqsubseteq$ the lifting of set inclusion $\subseteq$ to the set $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$:

$$\forall \Sigma, \Sigma' \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States}), \quad \Sigma \sqsubseteq \Sigma' \text{ iff. } (\Sigma' = \lightning \vee \Sigma \subseteq \Sigma')$$

Let $\sqcup$ denote the lifting of set union to the set $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$.

The ideal monitor relies on the collecting semantics for branching commands. Therefore, we also lift the collecting semantics to the set $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$, by letting $\{\!|c|\!\}\lightning \triangleq \lightning$. This guarantees that both the ideal monitor and the collecting semantics are monotonic.

The ideal monitor can be seen as a hybrid monitor comprised of a dynamic part and a static part. It directly handles the dynamic part, but delegates the static part to the collecting semantics. The dynamic part consists of tracking the minor states that follow the same execution path as the major state, whereas the static part consists in tracking the minor states that follow a different execution path. The monitor semantics of conditional commands best illustrates the intertwining between the dynamic and static part of this ideal monitor. When the major state evaluates the conditional guard to true, the monitoring semantics continues tracking all minor states that also evaluate the guard to true. As for the minor states that evaluate the conditional guard to false, they are propagated through the else-branch by the collecting semantics. Notice that the monitor semantics of conditionals ignores annotation commands in non-executed branches. We revisit this later.

**Ideal monitor** $(\!|-|\!)_-$ $\quad \text{grd}^\sigma_b$

$$\text{snd}(\sigma, \Sigma) \triangleq \Sigma \qquad \text{grd}^b_\sigma(\Sigma) \triangleq \{\tau \in \Sigma \mid [\![b]\!]\tau = \mathit{true}\}$$

$$(\!|c|\!)_\sigma \lightning \triangleq \lightning \qquad (\!|id := e|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \triangleq \{[\![id := e]\!]\tau \mid \tau \in \Sigma\}$$

$$(\!|c_1; c_2|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \triangleq (\!|c_2|\!)_{[\![c_1]\!]\sigma} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \qquad (\!|\textbf{skip}|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \triangleq \Sigma$$

$$(\!|\textbf{assume } \Phi|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \triangleq \{\tau \in \Sigma \mid \quad \sigma \shortmid \tau \models \Phi\}$$

$$(\!|\textbf{assert } \Phi|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \triangleq \begin{cases} \Sigma & \text{if } \forall \tau \in \Sigma, \sigma \shortmid \tau \models \Phi \\ \lightning & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$(\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_0|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \triangleq \begin{cases} (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \text{grd}^b_\sigma \Sigma \sqcup \{\!|c_0|\!\} \circ \text{grd}^{\neg b} \Sigma & \text{if } [\![b]\!]\sigma \\ \{\!|c_1|\!\} \circ \text{grd}^b \Sigma \sqcup (\!|c_0|\!)_\sigma \circ \text{grd}^{\neg b}_\sigma \Sigma & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$(\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \triangleq \text{snd}\left(\left(\text{lfp}^{\dot{\preccurlyeq} \times \dot{\sqsubseteq}}_{\lambda(\sigma,\Sigma).(\bot,\emptyset)} \mathcal{G}\right)(\sigma, \Sigma)\right)$$

$$\mathcal{G}(w)(\sigma, \Sigma) \triangleq \begin{cases} (\sigma, \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\}\Sigma) & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w\,([\![c]\!]\sigma, (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)_\sigma \Sigma) & \text{otherw.} \end{cases}$$

For **assume** $\Phi$, the ideal monitor reduces the initial tracking set $\Sigma$ to the set of minor states $\tau$ whose pairing with the major state $\sigma$ satisfy the relational formula $\Phi$. The monitor rules out all alternative executions on the same control path that do not comply with the assumption $\Phi$. These are termed "assumption failures" in [23].

For **assert** $\Phi$, the ideal monitor checks whether all minor states in the initial tracking set $\Sigma$ satisfy the relational formula $\Phi$ when paired with the current major state $\sigma$. If so, the monitor returns $\Sigma$. Otherwise, the monitor concludes that one of the alternative executions — that satisfies all assumptions encountered so far — falsifies the assertion when paired with the major state. So the semantics signals a security violation by returning fault $\lightning$.

For while loops, the ideal monitor is defined as the least fixpoint of a functional $\mathcal{G}$ that formalises the simultaneous evaluation on both the major state and the tracking set. Erasing operations related to tracking sets in the functional $\mathcal{G}$ yields the functional $\mathcal{F}$ used in the standard denotational semantics. Along the iteration of the major state on the loop body, the ideal monitor iterates the tracking set on a conditional — ensuring only minor states that have not yet reached a fixpoint go through an additional iteration of the loop body. When the major state reaches a fixpoint (i.e. $\neg[\![b]\!]\sigma$), the tracking set is fed to the

collecting semantics before exiting the loop — ensuring all minor states reach their fixpoint.

Like the collecting semantics, the ideal monitor is defined over concrete executions. Therefore, there is no loss of information, in the sense that the ideal monitor returns a fault iff. there is a minor state that falsifies the assertion.

The semantics of the ideal monitor is the concrete specification for a more abstract monitor whose transfer functions are computable. We will rely on the framework of abstract interpretation in order to derive sound monitors by approximating both the concrete collecting semantics and the ideal monitor.

The ideal monitor and the collecting semantics are equivalent for annotation-free commands, as long as the major run terminates.

**Lemma 2 .** For all annotation-free commands $c$, all $\sigma \in \mathrm{States}$ such that $[\![c]\!]\sigma \neq \bot$, and all sets $\Sigma \subseteq \mathrm{States}$, it holds that

$$(\!|c|\!)_\sigma \Sigma = \{\!|c|\!\}\Sigma$$

In fact $(\!|c|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \subseteq \{\!|c|\!\}\Sigma$ as long as $c$ is assertion-free. The proof is by structural induction.

If the major run diverges, the least fixpoint of the functional $\mathcal{G}$ yields an undefined outcome $\bot$, paired with an empty set $\emptyset$ of minor states.

Assuming a set $in$ of variables considered low inputs, and a set $out$ considered low outputs, let us use the notation $\mathbb{A}in$ and $\mathbb{A}out$ to abbreviate the conjunction of basic agreements for these variables. Theorem 1 states that, for $c$ annotated following the pattern of Equation (1), the ideal monitor, parametrised with a major state $\sigma_1$, does not result in a fault $\lightning$ iff. the standard notion of termination-insensitive noninterference (***TINI***) holds for $c$ and $\sigma_1$.

**Theorem 1 .** Let $in$ and $out$ be two sets of variables and $c$ be an annotation-free command. Let command $\hat{c}$ be defined as **assume** $\mathbb{A}in$; $c$ ; **assert** $\mathbb{A}out$. For all $\sigma_1, \sigma_1' \in \mathrm{States}$ such that $[\![c]\!]\sigma_1 = \sigma_1'$, we have $(\!|\hat{c}|\!)_{\sigma_1} \mathrm{States} \neq \lightning$ iff.

$$\forall \sigma_2, \sigma_2' \in \mathrm{States}, [\![c]\!]\sigma_2 = \sigma_2' \wedge \sigma_1 =_{in} \sigma_2 \Longrightarrow \sigma_1' =_{out} \sigma_2'$$

Here we write $=_{in}$ to indicate agreement on the variables $in$.

The security property in [23] allows intermediate annotations, but disallows them in high branches, to ensure robustness of declassification etc. In an Appendix we provide an alternative ideal monitor and an alternative collecting semantics, both of which fault $\lightning$ if an assertion or assumption occurs in a ***high conditional*** — one for which some minor states do not agree with the major state on its conditional guard.

**Strong conjecture:** for terminating executions, the security property in [23] holds iff. the alternative ideal monitor does not fault.

The alternative ideal monitor is a simple variation, but with the notational complication of threading an additional parameter through the definitions. So we do not use it in the body of the paper. However, for each of the derived monitors, there is a very similar one derived from the alternate ideal monitor, and therefore sound with respect to the security property in [23].

In summary, the idea is that from an initial state $\sigma$, a monitored execution evaluates $[\![c]\!]\sigma$ and in parallel should evaluate an abstraction of $(\!|c|\!)_\sigma$, written $(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma$. The monitored execution yields $\sigma'$, with $[\![c]\!]\sigma = \sigma'$, if it can guarantee that $(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \mathrm{States} \neq \lightning$. Otherwise, there is a potential security violation. This parallel evaluation can be formalized, as it is in the functional $\mathcal{G}$ for the monitor semantics of loops, but to streamline notation in the rest of the paper we focus on what is returned by the ideal monitor.

## IV. Lattice of Relational Formulas

The derived monitors use abstract interpretations based on relational formulas. This section defines the abstraction and uses it to derive a generic monitor that is refined in Section V.

First we define the lattice of relational formulas. To make it finite, expressions in relational formulas are restricted to those that occur in the program to be monitored, as well as their negations to facilitate precision in the monitors we derive.

A set of formulas is interpreted conjunctively. To streamline notation we confuse a conjunctive formula, say "$\mathbb{A}x, \mathbb{A}y$", with the set $\{\mathbb{A}x, \mathbb{A}y\}$. That is why the lattice is defined in terms of basic formulas.

**Lattice of relational formulas** $\mathcal{L}$ $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$

**Assumption:** for a given command $c$, let $\mathcal{L}$ be a finite set of basic relational formulas that is closed under negation of boolean expressions and which contains at least $\mathbb{B}b$, $\mathbb{A}e$, and $\mathbb{B}b \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}e$ for every $b$ and $e$ that occur in $c$.

We use the powerset $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ as a lattice ordered by $\supseteq$ with $\emptyset$ on top and intersection as join: $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}); \supseteq, \mathcal{L}, \emptyset, \cap, \cup)$. Let $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$ be $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \cup \{\lightning\}$. Let $\sqsubseteq^\sharp$ be the lifting of the partial order $\supseteq$ such that $\lightning$ is the top element of the lattice $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$:

$$(\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}); \sqsubseteq^\sharp, \mathcal{L}, \lightning, \sqcup^\sharp, \sqcap^\sharp)$$

We also let $\sqcup^\sharp$ (resp. $\sqcap^\sharp$) denote the lifting of set intersection $\cap$ (resp. the lifting of set union $\cup$) to the lattice $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$.

The notation elides dependence of $\mathcal{L}$ on $c$ because $c$ should be the main program to be monitored; a fixed $\mathcal{L}$ will be used in the context of the monitor semantics which is recursively applied to sub-programs of $c$.

The monitor will maintain an over-approximation of the relational formulas satisfied by the major state $\sigma$ and every minor state $\tau$ of interest. A set of formulas is interpreted to mean all the formulas hold for every such pair $(\sigma, \tau)$. The empty set indicates no relations are known, whereas $\lightning$ serves to indicate that some required relation fails to hold.

Given a major state $\sigma$, we aim to define an approximation of a tracking set $\Sigma$, in order to account for relational formulas satisfied by the major state $\sigma$ and each minor state $\tau \in \Sigma$. Subsequently, we lift this abstraction in order to approximate the monitoring collecting semantics and obtain sound computable abstract transfer functions of a monitor tracking relational formulas. We formalise this abstraction of the

tracking set $\Sigma$ as a function $\alpha_\sigma$ that is parametrised by a state $\sigma$:

$$\alpha_\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$$
$$\alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) \triangleq \begin{cases} \lightning & \text{if } \Sigma = \lightning \\ \{\Phi \mid \forall \tau \in \Sigma, \sigma \shortmid \tau \models \Phi\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The associated concretisation function $\gamma_\sigma$ is also parametrised by a major state $\sigma$. The concretisation of a set $\Delta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ of relational formulas yields a set $\Sigma$ of minor states, such that every minor state $\tau \in \Sigma$ and the major state $\sigma$ satisfy all relational formulas $\Phi \in \Delta$.

$$\gamma_\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$$
$$\gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \triangleq \begin{cases} \lightning & \text{if } \Delta = \lightning \\ \{\tau \in \text{States} \mid \forall \Phi \in \Delta, \sigma \shortmid \tau \models \Phi\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 3 .** For all $\sigma \in \text{States}$, the pair $(\alpha_\sigma, \gamma_\sigma)$ is a Galois connection: $(\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States}); \sqsubseteq) \underset{\alpha_\sigma}{\overset{\gamma_\sigma}{\leftrightarrows}} (\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}); \sqsubseteq^\sharp)$. That is, $\forall \Sigma \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States}), \forall \Delta \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$:

$$\alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) \sqsubseteq \Delta \iff \Sigma \sqsubseteq^\sharp \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$$

Figure 1 illustrates the best abstraction of the monitoring collecting semantics $(\!|c|\!)_\sigma$. If a set $\Sigma$ of minor states is abstracted wrt. a major state $\sigma$ by a set $\Delta$ of relational formulas ($\Sigma \sqsubseteq \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$), then the resulting set $\Sigma' = (\!|c|\!)_\sigma \Sigma$ of minor states is abstracted wrt. the resulting major state $\sigma' = [\![c]\!]\sigma$ by the set $\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$ of relational formulas ($\Sigma' \sqsubseteq \gamma_{\sigma'}(\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta))$). This best abstract transformer




Figure 1. Best abstract transformer

is not computable in general. An abstract interpretation $(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma$ is ***sound*** if it satisfies the following condition:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \quad \text{where } \sigma' = [\![c]\!]\sigma \tag{4}$$

Note that we denote by $\dot{\sqsubseteq}$ (resp. $\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp$) the pointwise lifting to functions of the partial order $\sqsubseteq$ over $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$ (resp. of the partial order $\sqsubseteq^\sharp$ over $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$).

**Lemma 4 Soundness conditions.** Consider any $c, \sigma, \sigma'$ such that $\sigma' = [\![c]\!]\sigma$. Equation (4) is equivalent to each of the following:

$$(\!|c|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}} \gamma_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c|\!)_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma$$

In the process of deriving a sound abstract monitoring semantics $(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma$ approximating the monitoring collecting semantics $(\!|c|\!)_\sigma$, we also have to derive a sound abstract static semantics $\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$ approximating the static collecting semantics $\{\!|c|\!\} \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$.

Equation (3) provides a notion of soundness for static semantics, whereas Equation (4) provides a notion of soundness for monitoring semantics. While approximating the monitoring collecting semantics, we will find good ways for the abstract static and monitoring semantics to interact. In particular, the abstract static analyses we propose will account for that interaction by additional parameters. Additionally, we will also prove soundness results in Lemmas 5, 6 and 9 that embody not only the soundness condition of Equation (3), but also variations on that property that take into account this interaction between the dynamic and static analyses.

The derivation of a sound abstract monitoring semantics is by structural induction over commands. As an example, consider the case of a conditional command $c \triangleq$ **if** $b$ **then** $c_1$ **else** $c_0$, an initial state $\sigma$ and a final state $\sigma'$ such that $\sigma' = [\![c]\!]\sigma$. Let us consider the case where the guard evaluates to true ($[\![b]\!]\sigma = 1$), so that $\sigma' = [\![c_1]\!]\sigma$. Then, assuming a sound approximation $\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp$ of the static collecting semantics, we can derive a generic abstract monitoring semantics by successive approximation, beginning as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_0|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&= \alpha_{\sigma'}\big((\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \text{grd}^b_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \sqcup \{\!|c_0|\!\} \circ \text{grd}^{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\big) \\
&= \wr \text{Since } \alpha_{\sigma'} \text{ is additive: } \alpha_{\sigma'}(\Sigma \cup \Sigma') = \alpha_{\sigma'}(\Sigma) \sqcup^\sharp \alpha_{\sigma'}(\Sigma') \wr \\
&\quad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \text{grd}^b_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \sqcup^\sharp \\
&\quad\quad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c_0|\!\} \circ \text{grd}^{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\sqsubseteq^\sharp \wr \alpha_{\sigma'}, (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma, \text{ and } \{\!|c_1|\!\} \text{ are monotone, } \gamma_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \text{ is} \\
&\quad \text{extensive: } \lambda\Sigma.\Sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}} \gamma_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \wr \\
&\quad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \circ \text{grd}^b_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \sqcup^\sharp \\
&\quad\quad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c_0|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \circ \text{grd}^{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\sqsubseteq^\sharp \wr (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \text{ is sound by induction hypothesis of Equation (4)} \wr \\
&\quad (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \circ \text{grd}^b_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \sqcup^\sharp \\
&\quad\quad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c_0|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \circ \text{grd}^{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\sqsubseteq^\sharp \wr \text{The static analysis is sound: } \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c_0|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} \{\!|c_0|\!\}^\sharp \wr \\
&\quad (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \circ \text{grd}^b_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \sqcup^\sharp \\
&\quad\quad \{\!|c_0|\!\}^\sharp \circ \alpha_\sigma \circ \text{grd}^{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The above derivation is a routine use of abstract interpretation techniques. The last step uses a soundness property for the static part of the monitor that is similar to Equation (3). So far, we relied on an approximation of the monitoring collecting semantics of command $c_1$ and an approximation of the static collecting semantics of command $c_0$. To continue this generic derivation, we need to derive a sound approximation for the guard operators $\text{grd}^b_\sigma$ and $\text{grd}^{\neg b}$.

The approximation of $\mathrm{grd}^b_\sigma$ proceeds as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_\sigma \circ \mathrm{grd}^b_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\\
&= \alpha_\sigma(\{\tau \in \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \mid [\![b]\!]\tau = 1\})\\
&= \wr\text{since the major state evaluates } b \text{ to true}\wr\\
&\quad \alpha_\sigma(\{\gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \cap \{\tau \in \mathrm{States} \mid \sigma{\shortmid}\tau \models \mathbb{B}b\})\\
&= \alpha_\sigma\left(\{\gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \cap \gamma_\sigma(\{\mathbb{B}b\})\right)\\
&= \wr\gamma_\sigma \text{ is multiplicative: } \gamma_\sigma(\Delta \sqcap^\sharp \Delta') = \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \sqcap \gamma_\sigma(\Delta')\wr\\
&\quad \alpha_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}b\})\\
&\sqsubseteq^\sharp \wr\alpha_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \text{ is reductive: } \alpha_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}}^\sharp \lambda\Delta.\Delta\wr\\
&\quad \Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}b\} \qquad (6)
\end{aligned}$$

As for the approximation of $\mathrm{grd}^b$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_\sigma \circ \mathrm{grd}^b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) &\sqsubseteq^\sharp \wr\alpha_\sigma \text{ is monotone and } \mathrm{grd}^b \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}} \lambda\Sigma.\Sigma\wr\\
&\quad \alpha_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\\
&\sqsubseteq^\sharp \wr\text{since } \alpha_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \text{ is reductive}\wr\\
&\quad \Delta \qquad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

To sum up, we rewrite the approximations of operators $\mathrm{grd}^b_\sigma$ and $\mathrm{grd}^b$ of Equations (6) and (7) in the intermediate abstraction of conditionals obtained in Equation (5), so we can conclude:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_0|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\\
&\quad \sqsubseteq^\sharp \left((\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}b\})\right) \sqcup^\sharp \left(\{\!|c_0|\!\}^\sharp \Delta\right) \qquad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

This equation yields one of the generic approximations of conditional commands. It says that when the conditional guard is true, monitor the then branch and statically analyse the else branch.

In the following section, we specialise this generic approximation by relying on different approximations of the static collecting semantics.

Given the importance of relational formulas as an abstraction, it should be no surprise that some monitors rely on entailments among formulas. Precision can be improved by providing the monitor with strong means of logical deduction, but there is a cost in performance. This engineering trade-off can be left open, by just specifying what we need. We use the notation $\Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \Phi$, which is either true or false, as follows (cf. [23]).

**Approximate entailment** $\Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \Phi$

**Assumption:** For any $\Delta, \Phi$, if $\Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \Phi$ then the implication is valid. That is, for all $\sigma, \tau \in \mathrm{States}$, if $\sigma{\shortmid}\tau \models \Delta$ then $\sigma{\shortmid}\tau \models \Phi$.

## V. Monitor Derivation

We derive three different monitors from the ideal monitoring semantics. By relying on the framework of abstract interpretation, these monitors are correct by construction. Unless it is clear from context, we will differentiate the three abstract semantics of these monitors by prefixing them with the letters $\mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{I}$.

These three monitors illustrate different ways of reasoning about relational formulas in high branching commands. The first one treats high branching commands pessimistically by forgetting all known formulas. The second one relies on an approximation of the modified variables in order to determine which relational formulas cannot be falsified, a usual technique in hybrid monitors. The third one deduces new relational formulas by comparing the results of an interval value analysis to the current values in the monitored execution.

### A. Purely-Dynamic Monitor

Let us start by deriving a purely-dynamic monitor tracking relational formulas. This monitor is an instance of EM mechanisms [55]. Thus, it must observe only the execution steps of the major state. In particular, this monitor should not look aside [52], meaning that it does not rely on information about minor states that do not follow the same execution path as the major state. This scenario corresponds to approximating the collecting semantics $\{\!|c|\!\}$ by an abstract static semantics $\mathcal{D}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp$ that returns the top element of the lattice $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$, providing no information about minor states that do not follow the same execution path as the major state.

Definition 1 introduces such an abstract static semantics. We ensure it is strict by mapping the bottom element $\mathcal{L}$ of the lattice $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ to itself.

**Definition 1 .** The abstract static semantics $\mathcal{D}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp$ for a purely-dynamic monitor is given by:

$$\mathcal{D}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$$

$$\mathcal{D}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp \Delta \triangleq \begin{cases} \lightning & \text{if } \Delta = \lightning \\ \mathcal{L} & \text{if } \Delta = \mathcal{L} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 5 soundness of $\mathcal{D}\{\!|-|\!\}^\sharp$ .** For all $c$, $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathrm{States}$, it holds that: $\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}}^\sharp \mathcal{D}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp$.

Mapping $\mathcal{L}$ to $\mathcal{L}$ is sound because the bottom element $\mathcal{L}$ is concretised to the empty set of states (since $\mathcal{L}$ is closed under negation, thus it contains $\mathbb{B}b$ and $\mathbb{B}\neg b$ for some $b$).

A detailed derivation of the purely dynamic monitor, as well as subsequent derivations, are found in the Appendix.

Figure 2 presents the derived monitor. In it we use the notation $\Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \Phi$ for the approximate implication specified at the end of Section IV. The semantics for conditional commands is obtained from the generic derivation for conditionals, presented in Equation (8), by unfolding the definition of the static analysis $\mathcal{D}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp$.

The abstract monitoring semantics of any command maps fault to fault ($(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \lightning \triangleq \lightning$). For assignments $id := e$, the monitor invalidates all relational formulas that involve variable $id$. It also deduces that all resulting minor states agree with the major state on variable $id$, if $\Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}e$. For a sequence $c_1; c_2$, the initial state $\sigma$ is used to monitor $c_1$, and then the resulting major state $[\![c_1]\!]\sigma$ is used to monitor $c_2$.

For assumptions, the monitor adds the assumed formula to the input set. For asserts, the monitor returns fault $\lightning$ if it cannot determine that the known $\Delta$ implies the asserted $\Phi$.

$$(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \lightning \triangleq \lightning \qquad (\!|\textbf{skip}|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta \triangleq \Delta \qquad (\!|c_1; c_2|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta \triangleq (\!|c_2|\!)^\sharp_{[\![c_1]\!]\sigma} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta$$

$$(\!|id := e|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta \triangleq \{\Phi \in \Delta \mid id \notin \mathrm{fv}(\Phi)\} \sqcap^\sharp \begin{cases} \mathbb{A}id & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}e \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \qquad (\!|\textbf{assume } \Phi|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta \triangleq \Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\Phi\}$$

$$(\!|\textbf{assert } \Phi|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta \triangleq \begin{cases} \Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\Phi\} & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \Phi \\ \lightning & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \qquad (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_0|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta \triangleq \begin{cases} \begin{cases} (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}b\}) & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & \text{if } [\![b]\!]\sigma \\ \begin{cases} (\!|c_0|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\}) & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \end{cases}$$

$$(\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta \triangleq \mathrm{snd}\left((\mathrm{lfp}^{\dot\preccurlyeq \times \dot\sqsubseteq^\sharp}_{\lambda(\sigma,\Delta).(\bot,\mathcal{L})} \mathcal{G}^\sharp)(\sigma, \Delta)\right)$$

$$\text{where } \mathcal{G}^\sharp(w^\sharp)(\sigma,\Delta) \triangleq \begin{cases} \sigma, \lightning & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \text{ and } \Delta = \lightning \\ \sigma, \Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \text{ and } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \sigma, \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{otherwise if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w^\sharp\big([\![c]\!]\sigma, (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta\big) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Figure 2. Purely-dynamic monitor $\mathcal{D}(\!|-|\!)^\sharp_-$, as abstract semantics derived from the ideal monitor

For conditionals, if the monitor is unable to determine that all minor states agree with the major state on the value of the conditional guard, it must treat it as a "high conditional". So the purely-dynamic monitor conservatively forgets all known relational formulas.

Similarly to the standard denotational semantics and the ideal monitor semantics, the abstract monitoring semantics of loops is defined as a fixpoint of an abstract functional $\mathcal{G}^\sharp$. This abstract fixpoint behaves as a finite sequence of conditionals. To each iteration of the major state through the loop body corresponds a simultaneous iteration of the monitor on a conditional. It is important that the monitor treats each iteration of the loop body as a conditional, in order to soundly track formulas satisfied by minor states that exit the loop before the major state. When the major state exits the loop, the monitor relies on the static analysis in order to account for minor states that may continue iterating through the loop.

**Theorem 2 .** The abstract monitoring semantics $\mathcal{D}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma$ of the purely-dynamic monitor is sound. For all commands $c$, for all $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathrm{States}$ such that $\sigma' = [\![c]\!]\sigma$, it holds that:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \mathrel{\dot\sqsubseteq^\sharp} \mathcal{D}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma$$

Similarly to the No-Sensitive Upgrade (***NSU***) approach [59, Section 3.2] [8], the purely-dynamic monitor of Figure 2 is relatively efficient, at the cost of precision (i.e., it rejects many secure executions). However, notice that both purely-dynamic approaches are incomparable. Indeed, consider for instance the program in Listing 1 where only variable `secret` is high. An NSU approach would stop the program when the assignment to public is executed, signaling a possible security violation. In contrast, our purely dynamic monitor simply forgets all known relational formulas at the merge point of the conditional; in the case of simple agreements, this is tantamount to labelling

```
0 // σ0 ≜ [secret → 1; public → 0], Δ0 = ∅
1 assume Apublic; // [secret → 1; public → 0], {Apublic}
2 if (secret > 0) then {
3   public := public + 1;
4 } // [secret → 1; public → 1], {Apublic, B(secret > 0)}
5 else {
6   skip;
7 } // [secret → 1; public → 1], ∅
8 y := 0; // [secret → 1; public → 1, y → 0], {Ay}
9 assert Ay; [secret → 1; public → 1, y → 0], {Ay}
```

Listing 1. Example program

all variables as high. Thus, at the assignment to variable `y`, our monitor deduces that all minor states agree with the major state on the value of `y`, which means that no security violation is raised since the relational assertion is satisfied. Notice that if this example program asserts `Apublic` instead of `Ay`, our monitor would always signal a violation $\lightning$, whereas a NSU approach would not signal a fault when the conditional guard evaluates to false (`secret` $\leq 0$).

### *B. Hybrid Monitor with the Modified Variables*

To achieve more precision, we need non-trivial static analysis to provide information about minor runs that do not follow the same execution path as the major run ("high branches"). The next monitor relies on an over-approximation of variables that are modified by a command.

**Modifiable variables** Mod

**Assumption:** $\mathrm{Mod} \in Com \to \mathcal{P}(Var)$ satisfies the following: for all $c, id$, if there is $\sigma$ with $[\![c]\!]\sigma \neq \bot$ and $[\![c]\!]\sigma(id) \neq \sigma(id)$ then $id \in \mathrm{Mod}(c)$.

For our simple language, the obvious implementation is to

return the set of assignment targets.

Instead of conservatively forgetting about all known relational formulas at the merge point of high conditionals, the monitor will be able to retain information about variables that are modified in neither conditional branches, similarly to existing hybrid monitors [42], [52].

Guided by the soundness condition, we derive an abstract static semantics that leverages modified variables.

**Definition 2 .** For all commands $c$ and $c'$, the abstract static semantics $\mathcal{M}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp_{c'}$ for modified variables is given by:

$$\mathcal{M}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp_{c'} \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$$

$$\mathcal{M}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp_{c'}\Delta \triangleq \begin{cases} \lightning & \text{if } \Delta = \lightning \\ \mathcal{L} & \text{if } \Delta = \mathcal{L} \\ \{\Phi \in \Delta \mid \forall id \in \mathrm{fv}(\Phi), & \\ \quad id \notin \mathrm{Mod}(c) \cup \mathrm{Mod}(c')\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The soundness condition is similar to Lemma 5, adapted to the extra parameter.

**Lemma 6 soundness of $\mathcal{M}\{\!|-|\!\}^\sharp_-$ .** For all $c, c', \sigma, \sigma'$ such that $\sigma' = [\![c']\!]\sigma$, it holds that: $\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} \mathcal{M}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp_{c'}$.

For a given set $\Delta$ of relational formulas that hold between an initial major state $\sigma$ and every initial minor state $\tau \in \Sigma$, this abstract static semantics deduces a set $\Delta'$ of relational formulas that hold between an output major state $\sigma' = [\![c']\!]\sigma$ and every output minor state $\tau' = [\![c]\!]\tau$. Intuitively, the set $\Delta'$ is deduced from $\Delta$ by keeping only the relational formulas that cannot be falsified since their free variables are not modified.

Figure 3 introduces the abstract semantics $\mathcal{M}(\!|c|\!)_\sigma$ of the hybrid monitor relying on a static analysis of modified variables. Most transfer functions are essentially the same as the ones introduced for the purely-dynamic monitor. Thus, we refer to Figure 2 and redefine only the ones that are different, namely conditionals and loops. The main difference compared to the purely-dynamic monitor resides in the treatment of high branchings. For a high conditional, the abstract static analysis of modified variables enables the hybrid monitor to deduce that if a relational formula $\Phi$ holds before the conditional command and if its free variables are modified in neither conditional branches, then $\Phi$ also holds after the execution of the conditional command. This behaviour is similar to the treatment of high conditionals by existing hybrid information flow monitors [42], [52]. However, our hybrid monitor does not rely on labelling the program counter with a security context in order to track implicit flows. This is similar to Besson et al.'s approach [16]; it facilitates better precision, as they show and we see in the next subsection.

**Theorem 3 soundness of $\mathcal{M}(\!|-|\!)^\sharp_-$ .** The hybrid monitor $\mathcal{M}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma$ is sound in the sense of Equation (4): for all $c, \sigma$:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} \mathcal{M}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \quad \text{where } \sigma' = [\![c]\!]\sigma$$

The derivation proof of this monitor is similar to the derivation of the previous purely-dynamic monitor. It mostly leverages the abstract static analysis of Definition 2 and Lemma 6, in order to treat more precisely high branching commands.

Although we avoid relying on explicit tracking of a security context, for reasons of precision, that is useful for another purpose: enforcing security policies such as robust declassification [60]. Recall the strong conjecture following Theorem 1. One can replay the derivation of all three of our monitors, starting from the alternative ideal monitor in Appendix A, with minimal changes. We thus obtain three alternative monitors that track a security context and are conjectured to be sound for the semantics in [23].

### C. Hybrid Monitor with Intervals

We now derive a hybrid monitor that relies on a static analysis approximating the range of values each variable may take. This allows to infer agreements even for locations that are modified in high branches.

**Interval analysis** $\{\!|-|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}$

**Assumptions:** $\mathrm{States}^{\mathrm{Int}}$ is a set of abstract environments mapping variables to intervals (and $\mathrm{States}^{\mathrm{Int}}_\lightning \triangleq \mathrm{States}^{\mathrm{Int}} \cup \{\lightning\}$). $\{\!|c|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \in \mathrm{States}^{\mathrm{Int}}_\lightning \to \mathrm{States}^{\mathrm{Int}}_\lightning$ is an interval static analysis satisfying: $\alpha^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}} \mathrel{\dot{\leq}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}} \{\!|c|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}$, with $(\alpha^{\mathrm{Int}}, \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}})$ being the Galois connection enabling its derivation: $(\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathrm{States}); \sqsubseteq) \underset{\alpha^{\mathrm{Int}}}{\overset{\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}}{\leftrightarrows}} (\mathrm{States}^{\mathrm{Int}}_\lightning; \leq^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}})$

Interval static analysis is standard [28]; we present one in full detail in the long version of the paper.

Unlike the previous hybrid monitor relying on the modified variables, this monitor reasons on the values variables may take, in order to establish relational formulas in the case of high branching commands. Similarly to the condition stated in Lemmas 5 and 6, the abstract static analysis $\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp$ must satisfy:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} \{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp$$

Let us derive such an abstract static analysis by relying on the interval analysis $\{\!|c|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma \\ &\quad \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} \text{⟅since } \alpha_{\sigma'}, \{\!|c|\!\} \text{ are monotone, } \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \alpha^{\mathrm{Int}} \text{ is extensive⟆} \\ &\qquad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \alpha^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \alpha^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \gamma_\sigma \\ &\quad \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} \text{⟅since } \alpha_{\sigma'}, \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}} \text{ are monotone, } \{\!|c|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \text{ is sound⟆} \\ &\qquad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \{\!|c|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \circ \alpha^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \gamma_\sigma \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Consequently, we can leverage an interval static analysis to derive a monitor tracking relational formulas, provided that we derive an interface between the two abstractions. First, we have to approximate the operator $\alpha^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \gamma_\sigma$ which translates relational formulas — that holds wrt. a major state $\sigma$ — to interval constraints over variables. Second, we need to approximate the operator $\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}$ which translates interval constraints over variables to relational formulas — that holds wrt. a major state $\sigma'$.

$$(\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_0|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta \triangleq$$
$$\begin{cases} \begin{cases} (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}b\}) & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}b\}) \sqcup^\sharp \{\Phi \in \Delta \mid \mathrm{fv}(\Phi) \cap (\mathrm{Mod}(c_1) \cup \mathrm{Mod}(c_0)) = \emptyset\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & \text{if } [\![b]\!]\sigma \\ \begin{cases} (\!|c_0|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\}) & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ (\!|c_0|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\}) \sqcup^\sharp \{\Phi \in \Delta \mid \mathrm{fv}(\Phi) \cap (\mathrm{Mod}(c_1) \cup \mathrm{Mod}(c_0)) = \emptyset\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \end{cases}$$

$$(\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta \triangleq \mathrm{snd}\left((\mathrm{lfp}^{\dot{\preccurlyeq} \times \dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp}_{\lambda(\sigma,\Delta).(\bot,\mathcal{L})} \mathcal{G}^\sharp)(\sigma, \Delta)\right)$$

$$\mathcal{G}^\sharp(w^\sharp)(\sigma,\Delta) \triangleq \begin{cases} \sigma, \lightning & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \text{ and } \Delta = \lightning \\ \sigma, \Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \text{ and } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \sigma, \left(\{\Phi \in \Delta \mid \mathrm{fv}(\Phi) \cap \mathrm{Mod}(c) = \emptyset\} \sqcup^\sharp \Delta\right) \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{otherwise if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w^\sharp\left([\![c]\!]\sigma, (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta\right) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Figure 3. Hybrid monitor $\mathcal{M}(\!|-|\!)^\sharp_-$ using modified variables

These two operators $\alpha^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \gamma_\sigma$ and $\alpha_\sigma \circ \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}$ are similar to Granger's reduced product operators [26], [36] over the Cartesian product of both intervals and relational formulas, as we shall explain.

Since combining different static analyses independently by relying on a Cartesian product does not yield optimal results in general, abstract interpretation relies on a notion of a reduced products [29], in order to enable the sharing of information between the different abstractions and gain more precision.

Let $(\alpha^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma, \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma)$ be the Galois connection associated with the Cartesian product of both abstractions: $\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma(\imath, \Delta) \triangleq \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \sqcap \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$ and $\alpha^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma(\Sigma) \triangleq (\alpha^{\mathrm{Int}}(\Sigma), \alpha_\sigma(\Sigma))$.

**Definition 3 .** A Granger's reduced product for the Cartesian abstraction $\mathrm{States}^{\mathrm{Int}}_\lightning \times \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$ is a pair of operators $\mathrm{toint}_\sigma \in \mathrm{States}^{\mathrm{Int}}_\lightning \times \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \to \mathrm{States}^{\mathrm{Int}}_\lightning$ and $\mathrm{tofor}_\sigma \in \mathrm{States}^{\mathrm{Int}}_\lightning \times \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$, parametrised by a state $\sigma \in \mathrm{States}$ and satisfying two conditions:

- Soundness: $\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma(\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\imath, \Delta), \Delta) = \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma(\imath, \Delta)$ and $\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma(\imath, \mathrm{tofor}_\sigma(\imath, \Delta))\, \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma(\imath, \Delta)$
- Reduction: $\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\imath, \Delta) \leq^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \imath$ and $\mathrm{tofor}_\sigma(\imath, \Delta) \sqsubseteq^\sharp \Delta$

**Lemma 7 .** For all $\sigma \in \mathrm{States}$, any pair of operators that is a Granger's reduced product $(\mathrm{toint}_\sigma, \mathrm{tofor}_\sigma)$ for the Cartesian abstraction $\mathrm{States}^{\mathrm{Int}}_\lightning \times \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$ provides a sound approximation of the interface between intervals and relational formulas:

$$\alpha^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \gamma_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\leq}}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \lambda\Delta.\, \mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\lightning, \Delta) \text{ and}$$
$$\alpha_\sigma \circ \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}} \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}}^\sharp \lambda\imath.\, \mathrm{tofor}_\sigma(\imath, \lightning)$$

The proof of this result applies to any abstraction and is not limited to an interval analysis. In a nutshell, for any off-the-shelf static analysis, we can define a Granger's reduced product for its Cartesian product with the relational formulas in order to interface this analysis with our monitor, and guarantee soundness by Equation (9). Therefore, we introduce in the following a pair of operators $(\mathrm{toint}_\sigma, \mathrm{tofor}_\sigma)$, that we prove defines a Granger's reduced product for the Cartesian product of intervals and relational formulas, in Lemma 8.

**A Granger's reduced product** $\mathrm{toint}_\sigma$ $\mathrm{tofor}_\sigma$

$$\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\imath, \lightning) \triangleq \imath \qquad \mathrm{tofor}_\sigma(\lightning, \Delta) \triangleq \Delta$$
$$\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\imath, \Delta) \triangleq \bigsqcap^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_{\Phi \in \Delta} \mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\imath, \{\Phi\})$$
$$\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\imath, \{\mathbb{A}e\}) \triangleq \imath \sqcap^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \mathrm{grd}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_{e=v}(\imath) \quad \text{with } v \triangleq [\![e]\!]\sigma$$
$$\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\imath, \{\mathbb{B}b\}) \triangleq \imath \sqcap^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \mathrm{grd}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_b(\imath) \qquad \max([a,b]) \triangleq b$$
$$\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\imath, \{\mathbb{B}b \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}e\}) \triangleq \imath \qquad \min([a,b]) \triangleq a$$
$$\mathrm{tofor}_\sigma(\imath, \Delta) \triangleq \Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{A}x \mid \min(\imath(x)) = \max(\imath(x)) = \sigma(x)\}$$

**Lemma 8 .** For all $\sigma \in \mathrm{States}$, the pair of operators $\mathrm{toint}_\sigma, \mathrm{tofor}_\sigma$ is a Granger's reduced product.

The proof derives the definition from the required properties.

The operator $\mathrm{toint}_\sigma$ reduces an interval environment $\imath$ by accounting for the additional constraint that a set of relational formulas must hold wrt. to a state $\sigma$. For instance, reducing $\imath$ to account for a set of constraints $\Delta$ amounts to computing the intersection over the reduced interval environments wrt. each formula $\Phi \in \Delta$. Also, reducing $\imath$ to account for the constraint that $\mathbb{A}e$ holds wrt. to a major state $\sigma$ amounts to reducing $\imath$ to account for the additional constraint that expression $e$ evaluates to a particular value $[\![e]\!]\sigma$ that is determined by the major state $\sigma$. This reduction can be achieved by using an abstract operator $\mathrm{grd}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_b$ that over-approximates the concrete operator $\mathrm{grd}^b$. The soundness of $\mathrm{grd}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_b$ guarantees the soundness of operator $\mathrm{toint}_\sigma$, and the abstract meet with the initial interval

environment also guarantees the reduction condition stated in Definition 3.

The operator $\mathrm{tofor}_\sigma$ reduces interval constraints over variables to a set of relational formulas that hold wrt. a major state $\sigma$. Whenever an interval environment $\imath$ maps a variable $x$ to a singleton value that matches $\sigma(x)$, we can deduce that all the minor states abstracted by $\imath$ agree with $\sigma$ on the value of $x$.

Notice that $\mathrm{tofor}_\sigma$ does not iterate over the finite lattice $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$, though in theory that can be done in order to determine all relational formulas that hold. A smarter way to improve the precision of $\mathrm{tofor}_\sigma$ would take hints from the monitored branch, by trying to prove that some particular relational formulas are satisfied wrt. the major state. This would improve precision for the statically analysed branch.

Having derived a sound approximation of the interface between intervals and relational formulas, we can resume the derivation started in Equation (9), using Lemmas 7 and 8, to obtain a sound abstract static semantics.

**Definition 4 .** For all $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathrm{States}$, the abstract static semantics $\mathcal{I}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp_{\sigma,\sigma'}$ based on $\{\!|c|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}$ is given by:

$$\mathcal{I}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp_{\sigma,\sigma'} \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$$

$$\mathcal{I}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp_{\sigma,\sigma'}\Delta \triangleq \begin{cases} \lightning & \text{if } \Delta = \lightning \\ \mathcal{L} & \text{if } \Delta = \mathcal{L} \\ \lambda\imath.\, \mathrm{tofor}_{\sigma'}(\imath, \lightning) \circ & \\ \quad \{\!|c|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \circ \mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\lightning, \Delta) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 9 soundness of $\mathcal{I}\{\!|-|\!\}^\sharp_{-,-}$ .** For all $c, c'$ and $\sigma, \sigma'$ in States it holds that:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} \mathcal{I}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp_{\sigma,\sigma'} \quad \text{where } \sigma' = [\![c']\!]\sigma$$

Figure 4 introduces the abstract monitoring semantics we derive for the hybrid monitor relying on intervals. Most abstract transfer functions are similar to the ones introduced for the purely-dynamic monitor. Thus, we refer to Figure 2 and redefine only the ones that are different, namely conditionals and loops. The main difference concerns branching commands, since we rely on the novel abstract static analysis of Definition 4.

**Theorem 4 .** The abstract monitoring semantics $\mathcal{I}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma$ of the hybrid monitor, introduced in Figure 4, is sound: For all $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathrm{States}$ such that $\sigma' = [\![c]\!]\sigma$, it holds that:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} \mathcal{I}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma$$

This monitor is sensitive to runtime values. It deduces new relational formulas for high branching commands, by comparing the major state with the results of an interval static analysis. Consider for instance the program in Listing 2, that is inspired by Müller and al. [47]. Despite being modified in conditional branches that depend on a high guard, variable `seed` does not leak sensitive data. Unlike the hybrid flow-sensitive monitors of Le Guernic et al. [42] and Russo and Sabelfeld [52], as well as the ones we introduce previously in Sections V-A and V-B, our monitor relying on an interval analysis determines that all minor states agree with the major state on the value of variable `seed` — at the merge point of the conditional, which corresponds to labelling this variable as low. Our hybrid monitor is similar in spirit to the hybrid monitor of Besson et al. [16] that is also able to deduce that variable `seed` does not convey any knowledge about sensitive data, by relying on a constant propagation static analysis.

```
0  // σ0 ≜ [seed → 3; secret_conf → 1...], Δ0 = ∅
1  assume 𝔸seed; // [seed → 3; secret_conf → 1...], {𝔸seed}
2  a := secret_base;
3  if (secret_conf) then {
4    b := secret_number; // [seed → 3...], {𝔸seed, 𝔹secret_conf}
5    // Complicated hash computation on the seed, a & b.
6    r := seed * a * b;
7    seed := 1 + seed; // [seed → 4...], {𝔸seed, 𝔹secret_conf}
8  }
9  else { // value-sensitivity: seed is initialised to a singleton interval
       // ι ≜ [seed → [3, 3]; r → [−∞, +∞]...]
10   // Complicated hash computation on the seed & a.
11   r := seed * a * 42; // [seed → [3, 3]; r → [−∞, +∞]...]
12   seed := 1 + seed; // [seed → [4, 4]; r → [−∞, +∞]...]
13 } // [seed → 4...], {𝔸seed}
14 assert 𝔸seed; // [seed → 4...], {𝔸seed}
```

Listing 2. Example program inspired by [47]

## VI. Related Work

Abstract interpretation has been used for static analysis of noninterference in a number of works including Kovàcs et al. [40], where security is explicitly formulated as 2-safety. Giacobazzi and Mastroeni show how abstract interpretation can be used to reason about downgrading policies and observational power of the attacker [34]. Here we focus on related work that addresses the challenge areas for IF monitoring identified in Sec. I: expressive policy, precision versus performance, and assurance of correctness.

To facilitate expression of the range of practical IF policies, researchers have proposed language based approaches that use types and other program annotations to label channels and for downgrading directives [6], [11], [20], [21], [48], [53], [57], [60]. In various ways, policies can refer to meaningful events and conditions in terms of program control and data state (including instrumentation to express policy [20]). Relational Hoare logic features assertions that express agreement or "low indistinguishability", enabling direct specification of conditional and partial dependency properties [1], [4], [14], [50]. A strength of the logic approach is that it can offer precise reasoning about complex data and control structures [3], [12], [50]. For end-to-end semantics of IF policies, epistemic formulations are effective [5]–[7], [10] and have been connected with relational logic [11]. Such a connection is evident in the IF property of [23], although it is not formalized there.

The generality and expressiveness of relational logic comes at the cost that it does not inherently enforce desirable constraints on policy. For example, consider the policy that the initial value of card number is secret, but the low four digits may be released upon successful authentication between merchant and customer. The relevant condition could be asserted at a

$$(\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_0|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta \triangleq \begin{cases} \begin{cases} (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}b\}) & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \big((\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}b\})\big) \sqcup^\sharp \lambda\imath.\, \mathrm{tofor}_{[\![c_1]\!]\sigma}(\imath, \lightning) \circ \{\!|c_0|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_{\neg b} \circ \mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\lightning, \Delta) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & \text{if } [\![b]\!]\sigma \\ \begin{cases} (\!|c_0|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\}) & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \big((\!|c_0|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\})\big) \sqcup^\sharp \lambda\imath.\, \mathrm{tofor}_{[\![c_0]\!]\sigma}(\imath, \lightning) \circ \{\!|c_1|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \circ \mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\lightning, \Delta) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \end{cases}$$

$$(\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta \triangleq \mathrm{snd}\left((\mathrm{lfp}^{\dot{\preccurlyeq}\times\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp}_{\lambda(\sigma,\Delta).(\bot,\mathcal{L})} \mathcal{G}^\sharp)(\sigma,\Delta)\right)$$

$$\mathcal{G}^\sharp(w^\sharp)(\sigma,\Delta) \triangleq \begin{cases} \sigma, \lightning & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \text{ and } \Delta = \lightning \\ \sigma, \Delta \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \text{ and } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \sigma, \big(\Delta \sqcup^\sharp \lambda\imath.\, \mathrm{tofor}_\sigma(\imath, \lightning) \circ \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \circ \mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\lightning, \Delta)\big) \sqcap^\sharp \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{otherwise if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w^\sharp\big([\![c]\!]\sigma, (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta\big) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Figure 4. Hybrid monitor $\mathcal{I}(\!|-|\!)^\sharp_-$ with an interval analysis

point in the code where the release takes place, together with assumed agreement on the expression $ccnum\%10000$, but the policy analyst could also assert that $ccnum$ refers to its initial value at this point — **assert** $\mathbb{B}(ccnum = oldcc)$ where $oldcc$ is a variable set to the initial value of $ccnum$ and not changed.

Concerning precision of purely dynamic monitors, the basic technique of No Sensitive Upgrade (NSU) [8], [59] has been refined [9], [17] and several implementations exist [18], [24], [37], [54]. Experience suggesting NSU is too imprecise — rejecting many secure executions — led Hedin et al. [37] to augment their monitor with static analysis of modified locations that heuristically suggests label upgrades, while relying on NSU for soundness. Hybrid monitors typically feature static analysis of modified variables. For the simple while language, a simple approximation is to find all assignment targets [42], [52]. For more complex data structure this requires memory abstraction [46]. For more precision it is better to take into account the actual low values [41]. The term "value-sensitive" is used by Hedin et al. [37] and Bello et al. [13] for the use of low values in the major run to determine the observable modifications.

As our third monitor shows, there is a second important way in which precision can be gained by sensitivity to low values. This is also done by Besson et al. [16] who propose a generic hybrid monitor for quantitative information flow by tracking the knowledge about sensitive data that is stored in each program variable. Their monitor is also parametrised by a static analysis. The monitors we derive by relying on abstract interpretation share some similarities with their monitors. Indeed, they also model a purely-dynamic monitor by a static analysis that replies with top, forcing the monitor to treat high branching commands pessimistically. Additionally, their monitors do not rely on labelling the program counter with a security context.

For formal assurance of IF monitor correctness, several works provide detailed formal proofs [37], [54]; some are machine checked [15], [33], including Besson et al. [16]. Our work relies on the framework of abstract interpretation for the systematic design and derivation of security monitors. We hope our work will pave the way for the formal verification of practical security monitors, by reusing some of the recent developments in formal verification of abstract interpretation analysers [32], [38], [51].

## VII. Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper we propose an ideal monitor as a variation of a collecting semantics. We prove that this monitor enforces noninterference, for policies expressed using relational formulas, to which many other policy formalisms can be translated. We also conjecture (following Theorem 1) a relation with the security property proposed in [23] and taking into account intermediate assumptions (for downgrading) and assertions (for modularity and intermediate output). We would like to prove that conjecture, and strengthen it to account for intermediate assertions in divergent major runs. We believe this can be done using either transition semantics or trace based denotational semantics.

The ideal monitor is a specification that serves for deriving monitors that are sound by construction. We derive three monitors that illustrate various ways of tracking low indistinguishability and other relational formulas between states for high branchings. Although we provide a systematic approach by which precision can be fine tuned, we do not systematically evaluate the precision of the derived monitors. Several notions of evaluation have been proposed in the literature, using terms such as permissiveness and transparency. Bielova and Rezk [19] disentangle these notions. In their terms, precision in our sense — allowing more secure executions — is termed "true transparency".

A benefit of monitoring, relative to type systems or other static analyses for security, is the potential to leverage runtime values for precision. Almost all prior work uses value-sensitivity, if at all, as a means of improving precision to determine modifiable locations. An exception is Besson et

al. [16] who rely on constant propagation to delimit implicit flows based on actual values. A similar result is provided by our value-sensitive hybrid monitor using interval analysis. We rely on a classical notion in abstract interpretation, reduced product [29], to formalize the interactions between both the dynamic and the static part of the monitor. Lemma 7 and Equation (9) in particular are key results. By defining a Granger's reduced product, we can immediately leverage other off-the-shelf static analyses, such as polyhedra [31], trace partitioning [45], and constant propagation. Existing monitors already incorporate such complex static analyses that are spawned during or before the monitored execution [16], [43], [44]. Two challenges remain for the adoption of IF monitors: scaling them to complex and richer languages, and lowering the incurred overhead. We believe this paper makes a dent wrt. the first dimension, by linking the design of information flow monitors to the design of static analyses by the well-established theory of abstract interpretation [28]. As to the second challenge, we would like to investigate what static information can be pre-computed and how a monitor can take advantage of such information (beyond the easy case of modified variables in a toy language).

*Acknowledgments:* Thanks to Anindya Banerjee, Andrey Chudnov, and the anonymous reviewers for helpful feedback. The authors were partially supported by NSF award CNS-1228930.

## REFERENCES

[1] T. Amtoft and A. Banerjee, "Information Flow Analysis in Logical Form." *Static Analysis Symposium*, pp. 100–115, 2004.

[2] ——, "Verification condition generation for conditional information flow," in *ACM Workshop on Formal Methods in Security Engineering*, 2007, pp. 2–11.

[3] T. Amtoft, J. Hatcliff, and E. Rodríguez, "Precise and automated contract-based reasoning for verification and certification of information flow properties of programs with arrays," in *European Symposium on Programming*, ser. LNCS, vol. 6012, 2010.

[4] T. Amtoft, J. Hatcliff, E. Rodríguez, Robby, J. Hoag, and D. Greve, "Specification and checking of software contracts for conditional information flow," in *Formal Methods*, ser. LNCS, vol. 5014, 2008.

[5] A. Askarov and A. C. Myers, "Attacker control and impact for confidentiality and integrity," *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, vol. 7, no. 3, 2011.

[6] A. Askarov and A. Sabelfeld, "Gradual release: Unifying declassification, encryption and key release policies," in *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2007.

[7] ——, "Tight enforcement of information-release policies for dynamic languages," in *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*, 2009.

[8] T. H. Austin and C. Flanagan, "Efficient purely-dynamic information flow analysis," in *ACM Workshop on Programming Languages and Analysis for Security*, vol. 44, no. 8, Aug. 2009, pp. 20–31.

[9] ——, "Permissive Dynamic Information Flow Analysis," in *ACM Workshop on Programming Languages and Analysis for Security*. ACM, 2010, pp. 1–12.

[10] M. Balliu, M. Dam, and G. Le Guernic, "Epistemic temporal logic for information flow security," in *ACM Workshop on Programming Languages and Analysis for Security (PLAS)*, 2011.

[11] A. Banerjee, D. A. Naumann, and S. Rosenberg, "Expressive Declassification Policies and Modular Static Enforcement," in *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 339–353.

[12] B. Beckert, D. Bruns, V. Klebanov, C. Scheben, P. H. Schmitt, and M. Ulbrich, "Information flow in object-oriented software," in *Logic-Based Program Synthesis and Transformation LOPSTR*, ser. LNCS, no. 8901, 2014.

[13] L. Bello, D. Hedin, and A. Sabelfeld, "Value sensitivity and observable abstract values for information flow control," in *Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence, and Reasoning (LPAR)*, 2015, pp. 63–78.

[14] N. Benton, "Simple relational correctness proofs for static analyses and program transformations," in *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, 2004.

[15] L. Beringer, "End-to-end multilevel hybrid information flow control," in *Asian Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems (APLAS)*, ser. LNCS, 2012, vol. 7705, pp. 50–65.

[16] F. Besson, N. Bielova, and T. Jensen, "Hybrid information flow monitoring against web tracking," in *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 240–254.

[17] A. Bichhawat, V. Rajani, D. Garg, and C. Hammer, "Generalizing permissive-upgrade in dynamic information flow analysis," in *ACM Workshop on Programming Languages and Analysis for Security (PLAS)*, 2014.

[18] ——, "Information flow control in WebKit's JavaScript bytecode," in *Principles of Security and Trust (POST)*, 2014, pp. 159–178.

[19] N. Bielova and T. Rezk, "A Taxonomy of Information Flow Monitors," in *POST*, 2016, to appear.

[20] N. Broberg and D. Sands, "Flow Locks: Towards a Core Calculus for Dynamic Flow Policies," in *European Symposium on Programming*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006, pp. 180–196.

[21] N. Broberg, B. van Delft, and D. Sands, "Paragon for Practical Programming with Information-Flow Control," in *Asian Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems*, 2013, pp. 217–232.

[22] D. Cachera and D. Pichardie, "A Certified Denotational Abstract Interpreter," in *Interactive Theorem Proving (ITP)*, 2010, pp. 9–24.

[23] A. Chudnov, G. Kuan, and D. A. Naumann, "Information Flow Monitoring as Abstract Interpretation for Relational Logic," in *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 48–62.

[24] A. Chudnov and D. A. Naumann, "Inlined information flow monitoring for JavaScript," in *ACM SIGSAC conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2015, pp. 629–643.

[25] M. R. Clarkson and F. B. Schneider, "Hyperproperties." *Journal of Computer Security*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 1157–1210, 2010.

[26] A. Cortesi, G. Costantini, and P. Ferrara, "A Survey on Product Operators in Abstract Interpretation." *Festschrift for Dave Schmidt*, vol. 129, pp. 325–336, 2013.

[27] P. Cousot, "The calculational design of a generic abstract interpreter," in *Calculational System Design*, M. Broy and R. Steinbrüggen, Eds. NATO ASI Series F. IOS Press, Amsterdam, 1999, vol. 173, pp. 421–506.

[28] P. Cousot and R. Cousot, "Abstract interpretation: a unified lattice model for static analysis of programs by construction or approximation of fixpoints," in *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, New York, New York, USA, Jan. 1977, pp. 238–252.

[29] ——, "Systematic design of program analysis frameworks," in *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*. ACM, 1979, pp. 269–282.

[30] P. Cousot, R. Cousot, J. Feret, L. Mauborgne, A. Miné, D. Monniaux, and X. Rival, "Combination of abstractions in the ASTRÉE static analyzer," in *Asian Computing Science Conference (ASIAN)*, 2006, pp. 272–300.

[31] P. Cousot and N. Halbwachs, "Automatic Discovery of Linear Restraints Among Variables of a Program." in *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, 1978, pp. 84–96.

[32] D. Darais, M. Might, and D. V. Horn, "Galois transformers and modular abstract interpreters: reusable metatheory for program analysis," in *Object-Oriented Programming, Systems, Languages, and Applications (OOPSLA)*, 2015.

[33] A. A. de Amorim, N. Collins, A. DeHon, D. Demange, C. Hritcu, D. Pichardie, B. C. Pierce, R. Pollack, and A. Tolmach, "A verified information-flow architecture," in *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, 2014, pp. 165–178.

[34] R. Giacobazzi and I. Mastroeni, "Adjoining classified and unclassified information by abstract interpretation," *Journal of Computer Security*, vol. 18, no. 5, 2010.

[35] P. Granger, "Static analysis of arithmetical congruences," *International Journal of Computer Mathematics*, 1989.

[36] ——, "Improving the Results of Static Analyses Programs by Local Decreasing Iteration." in *Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 652, 1992, pp. 68–79.

[37] D. Hedin, L. Bello, and A. Sabelfeld, "Value-sensitive hybrid information flow control for a javascript-like language," in *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*, 2015, pp. 351–365.

[38] J.-H. Jourdan, V. Laporte, S. Blazy, X. Leroy, and D. Pichardie, "A Formally-Verified C Static Analyzer," in *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*. New York, New York, USA: ACM Press, 2015, pp. 247–259.
[39] M. Kindahl, "The galois connection in interval analysis," Uppsala University, Sweden, Tech. Rep., 1994, http://user.it.uu.se/~matkin/interval.ps.gz.
[40] M. Kovács, H. Seidl, and B. Finkbeiner, "Relational abstract interpretation for the verification of 2-hypersafety properties," in *ACM SIGSAC conference on Computer and Communications Security*. New York, New York, USA: ACM Press, 2013, pp. 211–222.
[41] G. Le Guernic, "Precise dynamic verification of confidentiality," in *Proceedings of the 5th International Verification Workshop in connection with IJCAR*, 2008.
[42] G. Le Guernic, A. Banerjee, T. P. Jensen, and D. A. Schmidt, "Automata-based confidentiality monitoring," in *Asian Computing Science Conference (ASIAN)*. Springer-Verlag, Dec. 2006.
[43] P. Mardziel, S. Magill, M. Hicks, and M. Srivatsa, "Dynamic enforcement of knowledge-based security policies," in *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 114–128.
[44] ——, "Dynamic enforcement of knowledge-based security policies using probabilistic abstract interpretation," *Journal of Computer Security*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 463–532, Jan. 2013.
[45] L. Mauborgne and X. Rival, "Trace partitioning in abstract interpretation based static analyzers," in *European Symposium on Programming*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, Apr. 2005, pp. 5–20.
[46] S. Moore and S. Chong, "Static Analysis for Efficient Hybrid Information-Flow Control," in *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 146–160.
[47] C. Müller, M. Kovács, and H. Seidl, "An Analysis of Universal Information Flow Based on Self-Composition," in *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 380–393.
[48] A. C. Myers, "JFlow: Practical Mostly-Static Information Flow Control." in *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, 1999, pp. 228–241.
[49] A. C. Myers, N. Nystrom, L. Zheng, and S. Zdancewic, *Jif: Java Information Flow*, May 2001, software release. http://www.cs.cornell.edu/jif.
[50] A. Nanevski, A. Banerjee, and D. Garg, "Dependent type theory for verification of information flow and access control policies," *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2013.
[51] D. Pichardie, "Modular Proof Principles for Parameterised Concretizations," in *Construction and Analysis of Safe, Secure, and Interoperable Smart Devices Second International Workshop, CASSIS , Revised Selected Papers*, G. Barthe, B. Grégoire, M. Huisman, and J.-L. Lanet, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006, pp. 138–154.
[52] A. Russo and A. Sabelfeld, "Dynamic vs. Static Flow-Sensitive Security Analysis," in *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 186–199.
[53] A. Sabelfeld and D. Sands, "Declassification: Dimensions and principles," *Journal of Computer Security*, vol. 17, no. 5, Oct. 2009.
[54] J. Santos and T. Rezk, "An information flow monitor-inlining compiler for securing a core of javascript," in *ICT Systems Security and Privacy Protection*, ser. IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology, 2014, vol. 428.
[55] F. B. Schneider, "Enforceable security policies," *ACM Transactions on Information and System Security*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 30–50, Feb. 2000.
[56] P. Shroff, S. F. Smith, and M. Thober, "Dynamic dependency monitoring to secure information flow," in *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*, 2007, pp. 203–217.
[57] D. Volpano, C. Irvine, and G. Smith, "A Sound Type System for Secure Flow Analysis," *Journal of Computer Security*, vol. 4, no. 2-3, pp. 167–187, 1996.
[58] G. Winskel, *The Formal Semantics of Programming Languages: an Introduction*. Cambridge, 1993.
[59] S. A. Zdancewic, "Programming languages for information security," Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 2002.
[60] S. Zdancewic and A. C. Myers, "Robust declassification," in *IEEE Computer Security Foundations Workshop*, 2001, pp. 15–23.

## APPENDIX A ALTERNATIVE IDEAL MONITOR

The alternative ideal monitor relies on an alternative collecting semantics. In a nutshell, both collecting semantics are instrumented to keep track of a boolean $\mathrm{a}$, that signals if annotation commands are allowed in the current context. Intuitively, in a low context, the boolean $\mathrm{a}$ is set to true, meaning that annotation commands are allowed. Otherwise, the boolean $\mathrm{a}$ is set to false, signifying that the current context is high, and disallowing annotation commands.

How does the monitoring semantics determine the security context? It simply checks what happens for branching commands: Are we already in a high security context? if not, are there some states that follow a conditional branch that is different from the one taken by the major state? If there are some states that follow a different control path, this means that both conditional branches ought to be treated as high branches. If the conditional is in a low security context and no minor states follow a different conditional branch, then both conditional branches are to be treated as low branches.

In high conditional branches, both the monitoring semantics and the collecting semantics return an error if an annotation command is encountered. This way, the monitoring semantics implicitly signals an alignment failure, as proposed in [23].

Figures 5 and 6 introduce the alternative ideal monitor and the alternative collecting semantics. We conjecture that this alternative ideal monitor returns an error iff. the monitor that is defined in [23] in terms of a tracking set results in either an alignment failure or an assertion failure. This conjecture remains to be proved.

$$(\!|c|\!)^{\mathrm{ann=a}}_{\sigma}\lightning \triangleq \lightning \qquad (\!|\textbf{skip}|\!)^{\mathrm{ann=a}}_{\sigma}\Sigma \triangleq \Sigma \qquad (\!|id := e|\!)^{\mathrm{ann=a}}_{\sigma}\Sigma \triangleq \{[\![id := e]\!]\tau \mid \tau \in \Sigma\}$$

$$(\!|c_1; c_2|\!)^{\mathrm{ann=a}}_{\sigma}\Sigma \triangleq (\!|c_2|\!)^{\mathrm{ann=a}}_{[\![c_1]\!]\sigma} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)^{\mathrm{ann=a}}_{\sigma}\Sigma \qquad (\!|\textbf{assume } \Phi|\!)^{\mathrm{ann=a}}_{\sigma}\Sigma \triangleq \begin{cases} \{\tau \in \Sigma \mid \sigma\imath\tau \models \Phi\} & \text{if } \mathrm{a} = true \\ \lightning & \text{if } \mathrm{a} = false \end{cases}$$

$$(\!|\textbf{assert } \Phi|\!)^{\mathrm{ann=a}}_{\sigma}\Sigma \triangleq \begin{cases} \Sigma & \text{if } \forall \tau \in \Sigma, \sigma\imath\tau \models \Phi \text{ and } \mathrm{a} = true \\ \lightning & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$(\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_0|\!)^{\mathrm{ann=a}}_{\sigma}\Sigma \triangleq \begin{cases} (\!|c_1|\!)^{\mathrm{ann=a}\wedge\mathrm{a}'}_{\sigma} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{b}_{\sigma}\,\Sigma \sqcup \{\!|c_0|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}\wedge\mathrm{a}'} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\,\Sigma & \text{if } [\![b]\!]\sigma \\ \{\!|c_1|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}\wedge\mathrm{a}'} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{b}\,\Sigma \sqcup (\!|c_0|\!)^{\mathrm{ann=a}\wedge\mathrm{a}'}_{\sigma} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}_{\sigma}\,\Sigma & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\text{with } \mathrm{a}' \triangleq \begin{cases} (\mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\,(\Sigma) = \emptyset) & \text{if } [\![b]\!]\sigma \\ (\mathrm{grd}^{b}\,(\Sigma) = \emptyset) & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \end{cases}$$

$$(\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!)^{\mathrm{ann=a}}_{\sigma}\Sigma \triangleq \mathrm{snd}\left(\left(\mathrm{lfp}^{\dot{\preccurlyeq}\times\dot{\sqsubseteq}}_{\lambda(\sigma,\Sigma).(\bot,\emptyset)}\,\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{a}}\right)(\sigma,\Sigma)\right)$$

$$\textit{with } \mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{a}}(w) \triangleq \lambda(\sigma,\Sigma).\begin{cases} \sigma, \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}}\Sigma & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w\,([\![c]\!]\sigma, (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)^{\mathrm{ann=a}}_{\sigma}\Sigma) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Figure 5. Alternative ideal monitor

$$\{\!|\textbf{skip}|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}}\Sigma = \Sigma \qquad \{\!|id := e|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}}\Sigma = \{\tau[id \mapsto [\![e]\!]\tau] \mid \tau \in \Sigma\} \qquad \{\!|c_1; c_2|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}}\Sigma = \{\!|c_2|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}} \circ \{\!|c_1|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}}\Sigma$$

$$\{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}}\Sigma = \{\!|c_1|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{b}\,(\Sigma) \sqcup \{\!|c_2|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\,(\Sigma) \qquad \{\!|\textbf{assume } \Phi|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}}\Sigma = \begin{cases} \Sigma & \text{if a} \\ \lightning & \text{if } \neg\,\mathrm{a} \end{cases}$$

$$\{\!|\textbf{assert } \Phi|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}}\Sigma = \begin{cases} \Sigma & \text{if a} \\ \lightning & \text{if } \neg\,\mathrm{a} \end{cases} \qquad \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}}\Sigma = \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(\mathrm{lfp}^{\sqsubseteq}_{\Sigma}\,\{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!\}^{\mathrm{ann=a}}\right)$$

$$\mathrm{grd}^{b}\,(\Sigma) \triangleq \{\tau \in \Sigma \mid [\![b]\!]\tau = true\}$$

Figure 6. Alternative collecting semantics

## APPENDIX B TABLE OF SYMBOLS

$\text{States} \triangleq Var \rightharpoonup \mathbb{Z}$ mappings from vars to integers

$\bot$ undefined outcome

$\text{States}_\bot \triangleq \text{States} \cup \{\bot\}$ set of outcomes

$\sigma \in \text{States}$ proper state

$\hat{\sigma} \in \text{States}_\bot$ outcome

$\lightning$ security violation, or fault

$\mathcal{P}(\text{States})$ powerset of States

$\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States}) \triangleq \mathcal{P}(\text{States}) \cup \{\lightning\}$

$\Sigma \in \mathcal{P}(\text{States})$ set of states

$\hat{\Sigma} \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$ set of states or fault

$\Phi, \Psi \in \mathcal{L}$ relational formulas

$\mathcal{L}$ the set of relational formulas

$\Delta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ a set of relational formulas

$\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \triangleq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}) \cup \{\lightning\}$

$\hat{\Delta} \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$ a set of relational formulas of fault

$[\![c]\!] \in \text{States}_\bot \to \text{States}_\bot$ denotational sem. of com.

$[\![e]\!] \in \text{States} \to \mathbb{Z}$ denotational sem. of exp.

$\{\!|c|\!\} \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$ collecting sem.

$(\!|c|\!)_\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$ ideal monitor sem.

$\mathcal{D}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp$ purely-dynamic monitor.

$\mathcal{M}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp$ hybrid mon. with modified vars

$\mathcal{I}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp$ hybrid mon. with modified intervals

$\mathcal{D}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp$ static analysis for purely-dynamic mon.

$\mathcal{M}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp_{c'}$ static analysis for hybrid mon. with modified vars

$\mathcal{I}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp_{\sigma,\sigma'}$ static analysis for hybrid mon. with intervals

$\sqsubseteq$ set inclusion lifted to $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$

$\sqcup$ set union lifted to $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$

$\sqcap$ set intersection lifted to $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$

$\sqsubseteq^\sharp$ "includes" ($\supseteq$) lifted to $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$

$\sqcup^\sharp$ set intersection lifted to $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$

$\sqcap^\sharp$ set union lifted to $\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$

$\preccurlyeq$ approximation order

$\alpha_\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$ abstraction function param. by $\sigma$

$\gamma_\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$ concretisation function param. by $\sigma$

$\alpha^\triangleright \in \text{States} \times \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States}) \to \text{States} \times \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$ generalised $\alpha_\sigma$

$\gamma^\triangleright \in \text{States} \times \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \to \text{States} \times \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\text{States})$ generalised $\gamma_\sigma$

## APPENDIX C BACKGROUND

### C-A Collecting Semantics

**Lemma 1 .** The displayed equations define the same semantics as Equation (2).

*Proof.* The proof of equivalence of both collecting semantics is by structural induction on commands. We feature in this proof one simple case (assignments) as well as the most interesting case that is the case of while loops.

1 – Case: assignments

$$\begin{aligned}\{\!|id := e|\!\}\Sigma &\triangleq \{[\![id := e]\!]\sigma \mid \sigma \in \Sigma \text{ and } [\![id := e]\!]\sigma \neq \bot\} \\ &= \{\sigma[id \mapsto [\![e]\!]\sigma] \mid \sigma \in \Sigma \text{ and } [\![id := e]\!]\sigma \neq \bot\} \\ &= \{\sigma[id \mapsto [\![e]\!]\sigma] \mid \sigma \in \Sigma\}\end{aligned}$$

2 – Case: skip

1 – Case: loops.

1.1 – Let us first prove the following intermediate result:

$$\{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\}\Sigma = \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(\mathrm{lfp}^{\subseteq}_{\emptyset}\lambda \mathrm{X}.\, \Sigma \cup \{\!|\mathrm{c}|\!\} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{\mathrm{b}}\left(\mathrm{X}\right)\right).$$

Indeed, let the sequence $(x^{\Sigma}_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be defined as:

$$x^{\Sigma}_n \triangleq \{\mathcal{F}^{(n)}(\bot)(\sigma) \in \mathrm{States} \mid \sigma \in \Sigma\}$$

Notice that for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$, the sequence $(\mathcal{F}^{(n)}(\bot)(\sigma))_{n\geq 0}$ converges and is equal to the evaluation of the while loop in the state $\sigma$ ($[\![\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c]\!]\sigma = \mathcal{F}^{(\infty)}(\bot)(\sigma)$), by definition of the denotational semantics of loops.

Let also the sequences $(y^{\Sigma}_n)_{n\geq 0}$ and $(g^{\Sigma}_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}y^{\Sigma}_n &\triangleq \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(g^{\Sigma}_n\right) \\ g^{\Sigma}_{n+1} &\triangleq \Sigma \cup \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{b}\left(g^{\Sigma}_n\right) \\ g^{\Sigma}_0 &\triangleq \emptyset\end{aligned}$$

Then, it holds that:

$$\forall \Sigma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{States}), \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, x^{\Sigma}_n = y^{\Sigma}_n.$$

Indeed, the proof proceeds by induction on $n$.

- $x^{\Sigma}_0 = \emptyset = y^{\Sigma}_0$
- Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that: $\forall \Sigma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{States}), x^{\Sigma}_n = y^{\Sigma}_n$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}x^{\Sigma}_{n+1} &= \{\mathcal{F}^{(n+1)}(\bot)(\sigma) \in \mathit{States} \mid \sigma \in \Sigma\} \\ &= \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(\Sigma\right) \cup \\ &\quad \{\mathcal{F}^{(n)}(\bot)([\![c]\!]\sigma) \in \mathrm{States} \mid \sigma \in \mathrm{grd}^{b}\left(\Sigma\right)\} \\ &= \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(\Sigma\right) \cup \\ &\quad \{\mathcal{F}^{(n)}(\bot)(\tau) \in \mathrm{States} \mid \tau \in \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{b}\left(\Sigma\right)\} \\ &= \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(\Sigma\right) \cup x^{\{\!|c|\!\}\circ \mathrm{grd}^{b}(\Sigma)}_n \\ &= \text{(By induction hypothesis)} \\ &\quad \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(\Sigma\right) \cup y^{\{\!|c|\!\}\circ \mathrm{grd}^{b}(\Sigma)}_n \\ &= \text{(By definition of } y^{\{\!|c|\!\}\circ \mathrm{grd}^{b}(\Sigma)}_n \text{ )} \\ &\quad \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(\Sigma\right) \cup \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(g^{\{\!|c|\!\}\circ \mathrm{grd}^{b}(\Sigma)}_n\right) \\ &= \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(\Sigma \cup g^{\{\!|c|\!\}\circ \mathrm{grd}^{b}(\Sigma)}_n\right) \\ &= \text{(for all } \Sigma,\ g^{\Sigma}_n = \bigcup_{0\leq k\leq n-1} (\{\!|c|\!\} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{b})^{(k)}(\Sigma) \text{ )} \\ &\quad \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(g^{\Sigma}_{n+1}\right) \\ &= y^{\Sigma}_{n+1} \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

1.2 – Let us now prove that :

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{lfp}^{\subseteq}_{\emptyset}\lambda \mathrm{X}.\, \Sigma \cup \{\!|\mathrm{c}|\!\} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{\mathrm{b}}\left(\mathrm{X}\right) = \\ &\qquad \mathrm{lfp}^{\subseteq}_{\emptyset}\, \lambda X.\Sigma \cup \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!\}X\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, let the sequence $(f^{\Sigma}_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}f^{\Sigma}_0 &\triangleq \emptyset \\ f^{\Sigma}_{n+1} &\triangleq \Sigma \cup \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!\} f^{\Sigma}_n\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that $f_n = g_n$:

- $f^{\Sigma}_0 = g^{\Sigma}_0 = \emptyset$.
- let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $f^{\Sigma}_n = g^{\Sigma}_n$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}g^{\Sigma}_{n+1} &= \Sigma \cup \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{b}\left(g_n\right) \\ &= (\mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(g_n\right) \subseteq g_n \subseteq g_{n+1}) \\ &\quad \Sigma \cup \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{b}\left(g_n\right) \cup \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(g_n\right) \\ &= \Sigma \cup \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!\} g_n \\ &= \text{(By induction hypothesis)} \\ &\quad \Sigma \cup \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!\} f^{\Sigma}_n \\ &= f^{\Sigma}_{n+1} \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

1.3 – Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}&\{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\}\Sigma \\ &= \mathrm{grd}^{\neg b}\left(\mathrm{lfp}^{\subseteq}_{\emptyset}\lambda \mathrm{X}.\, \Sigma \cup \{\!|\mathrm{c}|\!\} \circ \mathrm{grd}^{\mathrm{b}}\left(\mathrm{X}\right)\right) \\ &= \mathrm{grd}_{\neg b}\left(\mathrm{lfp}^{\subseteq}_{\emptyset}\, \lambda X.\right. \\ &\quad \left.\Sigma \cup \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!\}X\right) \\ &= \mathrm{grd}_{\neg b}\big( \\ &\quad \mathrm{lfp}^{\subseteq}_{\Sigma}\, \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!\}\big) \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

## APPENDIX D MONITORING COLLECTING SEMANTICS

**Lemma 2 .** For all annotation-free commands $c$, all $\sigma \in \text{States}$ such that $[\![c]\!]\sigma \neq \bot$, and all sets $\Sigma \subseteq \text{States}$, it holds that

$$(\!|c|\!)_\sigma \Sigma = \{\!|c|\!\}\Sigma$$

*Proof.*

The proof is by structural induction on commands.

1 – Cases skip and assignments stem from the definition of the collecting semantics and the monitoring semantics.

2 – Case: sequence $c_1; c_2$

Let $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{States}$, such that $[\![c_1; c_2]\!]\sigma = \sigma'$. Then in particular, we know that $[\![c_1]\!]\sigma \in \text{States}$, meaning that it terminates.

$$\begin{aligned}(\!|c_1; c_2|\!)_\sigma \Sigma &= (\!|c_2|\!)_{[\![c_1]\!]\sigma} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \\ &= \text{(By induction twice, since } [\![c_1]\!]\sigma \in \text{States)} \\ &\quad \{\!|c_2|\!\} \circ \{\!|c_1|\!\}\Sigma \\ &= \{\!|c_1; c_2|\!\}\Sigma\end{aligned}$$

3 – Case: conditionals

Let $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{States}$ such that $[\![\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2]\!]\sigma = \sigma'$ Let us also assume that $[\![b]\!]\sigma = true$.

Then:

$$\begin{aligned}(\!|c|\!)_\sigma \Sigma &= (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \text{grd}^b(\Sigma) \cup \{\!|c_2|\!\} \circ \text{grd}^{\neg b}(\Sigma) \\ &\quad \text{(By induction on } c_1) \\ &\quad \{\!|c_1|\!\}\Sigma \circ \text{grd}^b(\Sigma) \cup \{\!|c_2|\!\} \circ \text{grd}^{\neg b}(\Sigma) \\ &= \{\!|c|\!\}\Sigma\end{aligned}$$

4 – Case: loops

Let $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{States}$ such that $[\![while\ b \textbf{ do } c]\!]\sigma = \sigma'$. Since the loop terminates, there exists a smallest $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $\mathcal{F}^{(k)}(\sigma) = \sigma'$. The natural $k$ is intuitively the number of executed iterations that must be executed before exiting the loop.

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}&(\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \\ &= \text{snd}\left(\mathcal{G}^{(k)}(\lambda(\sigma, \Sigma).(\bot, \emptyset))(\sigma, \Sigma)\right) \\ &= (\Sigma' \triangleq (\!|(\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else skip})^{(k-1)}|\!)_\sigma \Sigma) \\ &\quad \text{grd}^{\neg b}\left(\text{lfp}^{\subseteq}_{\Sigma'} \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!\}\right)\end{aligned}$$

Notice that we write $(c)^{(k-1)}$ as a shorthand for the sequence of commands $c; c; c; \ldots$, where $c$ is sequentially composed with itself $k-1$ times.

Additionally, by using the same proof as for conditionals, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma' &= \{\!|(\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else skip})^{(k-1)}|\!\}\Sigma \\ &= \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else skip}|\!\}^{(k-1)}\Sigma\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the fixpoint over $\Sigma'$ can be formulated as a fixpoint over $\Sigma$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{lfp}^{\subseteq}_{\Sigma'} \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!\} \\ &\quad = \text{lfp}^{\subseteq}_{\Sigma} \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!\}\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we deduce that:

$$\begin{aligned}&(\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \\ &\quad = \text{grd}^{\neg b}\left(\text{lfp}^{\subseteq}_{\Sigma} \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!\}\right) \\ &\quad = \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\}\Sigma \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

Notice that if $c$ is an assertion-free command, we have $(\!|c|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \subseteq \{\!|c|\!\}\Sigma$. The proof is exactly the same, and the only difference proceeds by noticing that $(\!|\textbf{assume } \Phi|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \subseteq \{\!|\textbf{assume } \Phi|\!\}\Sigma$.

Let us now prove the soundness of the monitoring semantics wrt. TINI.

**Theorem 1 .** Let $in$ and $out$ be two sets of variables and $c$ be an annotation-free command. Let command $\hat{c}$ be defined as **assume** $\mathbb{A}in$; $c$ ; **assert** $\mathbb{A}out$. For all $\sigma_1, \sigma_1' \in \text{States}$ such that $[\![c]\!]\sigma_1 = \sigma_1'$, we have $(\!|\hat{c}|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States} \neq \lightning$ iff.

$$\forall \sigma_2, \sigma_2' \in \text{States}, [\![c]\!]\sigma_2 = \sigma_2' \wedge \sigma_1 =_{in} \sigma_2 \implies \sigma_1' =_{out} \sigma_2'$$

*Proof.*

Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_1' \in \text{States}$ such that $[\![c]\!]\sigma_1 = \sigma_1'$.

Assume $(\!|\hat{c}|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States} \neq \lightning$.

Let $\sigma_2, \sigma_2' \in \text{States}$ and assume $\sigma_1 =_{in} \sigma_2$, and prove $\sigma_1' =_{out} \sigma_2'$.

Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}&(\!|\textbf{assume } \mathbb{A}in;\ c;\ \textbf{assert } \mathbb{A}out|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States} \\ &\quad = (\!|c;\ \textbf{assert } \mathbb{A}out|\!)_{\sigma_1} \circ (\!|\textbf{assume } \mathbb{A}in|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States} \\ &\quad = (\!|\textbf{assert } \mathbb{A}out|\!)_{\sigma_1'} \circ (\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_1} \circ (\!|\textbf{assume } \mathbb{A}in|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States} \\ &\quad \neq \text{(by assumption)} \\ &\quad \lightning\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\sigma_2 \in (\!|\textbf{assume } \mathbb{A}in|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States}$, since $\sigma_1 =_{in} \sigma_2$.

Therefore, $\sigma_2' \in (\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_1} \circ (\!|\textbf{assume } \mathbb{A}in|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States}$, since the monitoring semantics is equivalent to the collecting semantics for annotation-free commands (Lemma 2), and the collecting semantics is the lifting of the denotational semantics over a set of states (Lemma 1 and $\sigma_2' \in \text{States}$).

This means that $(\!|\textbf{assert } \mathbb{A}out|\!)_{\sigma_1'}\{\sigma_2'\} \neq \lightning$, by monotonicity of the monitoring semantics. Therefore:

$$\sigma_1' =_{out} \sigma_2'$$

– Case TINI $\implies (\!|\hat{c}|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States} \neq \lightning$:

Assume for all $\sigma_2, \sigma_2' \in \text{States}$ such that $[\![c]\!]\sigma_2 = \sigma_2'$, then $\sigma_1 =_{in} \sigma_2 \implies \sigma_1' =_{out} \sigma_2'$. Prove $(\!|\hat{c}|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States} \neq \lightning$.

Note that:

$$\forall \tau \in (\!|\textbf{assume } \mathbb{A}in|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States}, \sigma_1 =_{in} \tau$$

Therefore, $\forall \tau' \in (\!|c|\!) \circ (\!|\textbf{assume } \mathbb{A}in|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States}$, $\exists \tau \in (\!|\textbf{assume } \mathbb{A}in|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States}$ such that $\tau' = [\![c]\!]\tau$ and $\sigma =_{in} \tau$.

Thus, we deduce by assumption that $\forall \tau' \in (\!|c|\!) \circ (\!|\textbf{assume } \mathbb{A}in|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States}, \sigma' =_{out} \tau'$.

Consequently, it holds that:

$$(\!|\textbf{assert } \mathbb{A}out|\!)_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c|\!) \circ (\!|\textbf{assume } \mathbb{A}in|\!)_{\sigma_1} \text{States} \neq \lightning. \quad \square$$

**Lemma 10 The monitoring semantics is monotone.** For all major states $\hat{\sigma} \in \mathrm{States}_{\perp}$, it holds that:

$$\forall \hat{\Sigma}, \hat{\Sigma}' \in \mathcal{P}_{\lightning}(\mathcal{L}), \quad \hat{\Sigma} \sqsubseteq \hat{\Sigma}' \implies (\!|c|\!)_{\hat{\sigma}} \hat{\Sigma} \sqsubseteq (\!|c|\!)_{\hat{\sigma}} \hat{\Sigma}'$$

*Proof.*

The monitoring semantics is monotone, since the collecting semantics is monotone, and the monitoring semantics of both annotations is also monotone. Notice in particular that the monotonicity of assert annotations stems from the extension of the partial order $\subseteq$ to let $\lightning$ be the top element of $\mathcal{P}_{\lightning}(\mathcal{L})$.

## APPENDIX E ABSTRACT DOMAIN OF RELATIONAL FORMULAS

**Lemma 3 .** For all $\sigma \in \mathrm{States}$, the pair $(\alpha_\sigma, \gamma_\sigma)$ is a Galois connection: $(\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathrm{States}); \sqsubseteq) \underset{\alpha_\sigma}{\overset{\gamma_\sigma}{\leftrightarrows}} (\mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}); \sqsubseteq^\sharp)$. That is, $\forall \Sigma \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathrm{States}), \forall \Delta \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$:

$$\alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) \sqsubseteq \Delta \iff \Sigma \sqsubseteq^\sharp \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$$

Let us recall the definitions of $\alpha_\sigma$ and $\gamma_\sigma$:

$$\alpha_\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathrm{States}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$$
$$\alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) \triangleq_\lightning \{\Phi \mid \forall \tau \in \Sigma, \sigma \shortmid \tau \models \Phi\}.$$

$$\gamma_\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathrm{States})$$
$$\gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \triangleq_\lightning \{\tau \in \mathrm{States} \mid \forall \Phi \in \Delta, \sigma \shortmid \tau \models \Phi\}.$$

*Proof.*

Notice first that if $\Sigma = \lightning$, then $\alpha_\sigma(\lightning) \sqsubseteq^\sharp \Delta$ implies $\Delta = \lightning$, therefore $\Sigma \sqsubseteq \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$. Additionally, $\lightning \sqsubseteq \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$ also implies $\Delta = \lightning$, therefore $\alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) \sqsubseteq^\sharp \Delta$.

Also, if $\Delta = \lightning$, then both $\Sigma \sqsubseteq \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$ and $\alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) \sqsubseteq^\sharp \Delta$ are equivalent since they both hold.

Let us now assume $\Sigma \in \mathrm{States}$ and $\Delta \in \mathcal{L}$, and prove that:

$$\alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) \supseteq \Delta \iff \Sigma \subseteq \gamma_\sigma(\Delta).$$

– Case $\alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) \supseteq \Delta \implies \Sigma \subseteq \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) \supseteq \Delta &\implies \Delta \subseteq \{\Phi \mid \forall \tau \in \Sigma, \sigma \shortmid \tau \models \Phi\} \\
&\implies \forall \tau \in \Sigma, \forall \Phi \in \Delta, \sigma \shortmid \tau \models \Phi \\
&\implies \forall \tau \in \Sigma, \tau \in \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\implies \Sigma \subseteq \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

– Case $\Sigma \subseteq \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \implies \Delta \subseteq \alpha_\sigma(\Sigma)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma \subseteq \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) &\implies \forall \tau \in \Sigma, \tau \in \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\implies \forall \tau \in \Sigma, \forall \Phi \in \Delta, \sigma \shortmid \tau \models \Phi \\
&\implies \forall \Phi \in \Delta, \Phi \in \alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) \\
&\implies \Delta \subseteq \alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4 Soundness conditions.** Consider any $c, \sigma, \sigma'$ such that $\sigma' = [\![c]\!]\sigma$. Equation (4) is equivalent to each of the following:

$$(\!|c|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}} \gamma_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c|\!)_\sigma \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma$$

*Proof.*

Let $\sigma_0, \sigma \in \Sigma$ such that $\sigma = [\![c]\!]\sigma_0$. The best abstraction of the state transformer $(\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0}$ consists in concretising an abstract state $\Delta$, applying $(\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0}$ and then abstracting again using $\alpha_\sigma$: $\alpha_\sigma \circ (\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0} \circ \gamma_{\sigma_0}$. Therefore, the monitoring abstract semantics is sound if it holds that:

$$\alpha_\sigma \circ (\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0} \circ \gamma_{\sigma_0} \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_{\sigma_0}.$$

Let us now prove the equivalence of the 3 conditions.

–

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_\sigma \circ (\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0} \circ \gamma_{\sigma_0} \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_{\sigma_0} \\
&\quad \implies ((\alpha_\sigma, \gamma_\sigma) \text{ is a Galois connection}) \\
&\qquad (\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0} \circ \gamma_{\sigma_0} \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}} \gamma_\sigma \circ (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_{\sigma_0}
\end{aligned}$$

–

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0} \circ \gamma_{\sigma_0} \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}} \gamma_\sigma \circ (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_{\sigma_0} \\
&\quad \implies \text{(By monotony)} \\
&\qquad (\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0} \circ \gamma_{\sigma_0} \circ \alpha_{\sigma_0} \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}} \gamma_\sigma \circ (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_{\sigma_0} \circ \alpha_{\sigma_0} \\
&\quad \implies \text{(By monotony and } \gamma_{\sigma_0} \circ \alpha_{\sigma_0} \text{ being extensive)} \\
&\qquad (\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0} \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}} \gamma_\sigma \circ (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_{\sigma_0} \circ \alpha_{\sigma_0} \\
&\quad \implies \text{(By monotony)} \\
&\qquad \alpha_\sigma \circ (\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0} \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} \alpha_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \circ (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_{\sigma_0} \circ \alpha_{\sigma_0} \\
&\quad \implies (\alpha_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \text{ reductive}) \\
&\qquad \alpha_\sigma \circ (\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0} \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_{\sigma_0} \circ \alpha_{\sigma_0}
\end{aligned}$$

–

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_\sigma \circ (\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0} \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_{\sigma_0} \circ \alpha_{\sigma_0} \\
&\quad \implies \text{(By monotony)} \\
&\qquad \alpha_\sigma \circ (\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0} \circ \gamma_{\sigma_0} \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_{\sigma_0} \circ \alpha_{\sigma_0} \circ \gamma_{\sigma_0} \\
&\quad \implies \text{(By monotony and } \alpha_{\sigma_0} \circ \gamma_{\sigma_0} \text{ being reductive)} \\
&\qquad \alpha_\sigma \circ (\!|c|\!)_{\sigma_0} \circ \gamma_{\sigma_0} \mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp} (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_{\sigma_0} \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

## APPENDIX F MONITOR DERIVATION

### F-A Purely-Dynamic Monitor

We first start by proving the soundness of the abstract static analysis that the purely-dynamic monitor relies on.

**Lemma 5 soundness of $\mathcal{D}\{\!|-|\!\}^\sharp$ .** For all $c$, $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{States}$, it holds that: $\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma \dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp \mathcal{D}\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp$.

Let us recall the definition of this abstract static semantics:

$$\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$$
$$\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp\Delta \triangleq \begin{cases} \lightning & \text{if } \Delta = \lightning \\ \mathcal{L} & \text{if } \Delta = \mathcal{L} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.*

Let $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{States}$.

Notice first that $\{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp\lightning = \lightning$, therefore

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\lightning) \sqsubseteq^\sharp \{\!|c|\!\}^\sharp\lightning.$$

Let us now assume that $\Delta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$.

If $\Delta = \mathcal{L}$, and since $\gamma_\sigma(\mathcal{L}) = \emptyset$ ($\mathcal{L}$ contains at least an expression $e$ and its negation $\neg e$, therefore $\mathcal{L}$ is concretised to the empty set), we have:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\mathcal{L}) = \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c|\!\}\emptyset = \alpha_{\sigma'}(\emptyset) = \mathcal{L}$$

Additionally, we can always approximate an element of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$ by the top element of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$. Therefore, it holds that:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \sqsubseteq^\sharp \emptyset$$

□

Let us now prove the soundness of the abstract semantics of the purely-dynamic monitor we derive.

**Theorem 2 .** The abstract monitoring semantics $\mathcal{D}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma$ of the purely-dynamic monitor is sound. For all commands $c$, for all $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{States}$ such that $\sigma' = [\![c]\!]\sigma$, it holds that:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp \mathcal{D}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma$$

*Proof.*

Let us first rule out the error case:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\lightning) = \lightning \triangleq (\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma\lightning$$

1 – Case: skip

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_\sigma \circ (\!|\textbf{skip}|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) &= \alpha_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\ &\supseteq \Delta \\ &\triangleq (\!|\textbf{skip}|\!)^\sharp_\sigma\Delta \end{aligned}$$

2 – Case: assignments

Let $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{States}$ such that $\sigma' = [\![id := e]\!]\sigma$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|id := e|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\ &\quad= \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|id := e|\!)_\sigma \circ \{\tau \mid \forall \Phi \in \Delta, \sigma\vert\tau \models \Phi\} \\ &\quad= \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\tau[id \mapsto [\![e]\!]\tau] \mid \forall \Phi \in \Delta, \sigma\vert\tau \models \Phi\} \end{aligned}$$

2.1 – Note that $\forall \Phi \in \Delta$, such that $id \notin \text{fv}(\Phi)$, it holds that [23, Lemma 2 in Section II.B]:

$$\sigma\vert\tau \models \Phi \implies \sigma'\vert\tau[id \mapsto [\![e]\!]\tau] \models \Phi.$$

Therefore, $\forall \Phi \in \Delta$ such that $id \notin \text{fv}(\Phi)$, it holds that:

$$\Phi \in \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\tau[id \mapsto [\![e]\!]\tau] \mid \forall \Phi \in \Delta, \sigma\vert\tau \models \Phi\}.$$

2.2 – Otherwise, it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\big(\tau \in \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \wedge (\Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}e)\big) \\ &\quad\implies \sigma[id \mapsto [\![e]\!]\sigma]\vert\tau[id \mapsto [\![e]\!]\tau] \models \mathbb{A}id \\ &\quad\implies \text{(since } \sigma' = \sigma[id \mapsto [\![e]\!]\sigma]) \\ &\qquad \sigma'\vert\tau[id \mapsto [\![e]\!]\tau] \models \mathbb{A}id \end{aligned}$$

*It is worthwhile to note that this proof explicitly uses the fact that $\sigma'$ is the result of evaluation of the assignment `id:=e` on $\sigma$. This means that if we were to derive an abstract static semantics tracking relational formulas, we would not be able to deduce $\mathbb{A}e$, even if $\Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}e$. This is because we have no way of relating the abstraction of relational formulas wrt. $\sigma$ to an abstraction of relational formulas wrt. $\sigma'$, without additional information.*

Therefore, if $\Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}e$, then it holds that:

$$\mathbb{A}id \in \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\tau[id \mapsto [\![e]\!]\tau] \mid \forall \Phi \in \Delta, \sigma\vert\tau \models \Phi\}.$$

2.3 – Finally:

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|id := e|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\ &\qquad\supseteq \{\Phi \in \Delta \mid id \notin \text{fv}(\Phi)\} \cup \begin{cases} \mathbb{A}id & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}e \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &\qquad\triangleq (\!|id := e|\!)^\sharp_\sigma\Delta \end{aligned}$$

3 – Case: conditionals

Let $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{States}$ such that $\sigma' = [\![\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2]\!]\sigma$. Let us consider the case that $[\![b]\!]\sigma = true$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\ &\quad= \alpha_{\sigma'}\big((\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \text{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \cup \\ &\qquad\qquad \{\!|c_2|\!\} \circ \text{grd}_{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\big) \\ &\quad= \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \text{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \cap \\ &\qquad\qquad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c_2|\!\} \circ \text{grd}_{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \end{aligned}$$

We will now treat both branches separately before merging them.

3.1 – Then-branch:

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \text{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\ &\quad\supseteq \text{(by monotonicity and } \gamma_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \text{ being extensive)} \\ &\qquad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \circ \text{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\ &\quad\supseteq \text{(by induction hypothesis)} \\ &\qquad (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \circ \text{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\text{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \subseteq \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$, therefore:

$$\alpha_\sigma \circ \text{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \supseteq \alpha_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \supseteq \Delta$$

Additionally, since $[\![b]\!]\sigma = true$, and also:

$$\forall \tau \in \mathrm{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta), [\![b]\!]\tau = true$$

then it holds that: $\forall \tau \in \mathrm{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta), \sigma \imath \tau \models \mathbb{B}b$. Notice that we explicitly use the assumption that the major state evaluates to true. Therefore:

$$\mathbb{B}b \in \alpha_\sigma \circ \mathrm{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta).$$

To sum up, we obtain an approximation of $\mathrm{grd}_b$:

$$\alpha_\sigma \circ \mathrm{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \supseteq \Delta \cup \{\mathbb{B}b\}$$

Therefore, in the then-branch we have:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \mathrm{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \supseteq (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \cup \{\mathbb{B}b\}).$$

3.2 – Else-branch:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c_2|\!\} \circ \mathrm{grd}_{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\quad \supseteq \text{(by monotonicity and } \gamma_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \text{ being extensive)} \\
&\quad\quad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c_2|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \circ \mathrm{grd}_{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)
\end{aligned}$$

Since the major state $\sigma$ is assumed to evaluate to true, it holds that:

$$\alpha_\sigma \circ \mathrm{grd}_{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \supseteq \begin{cases} \mathcal{L} & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \Delta & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Therefore, in the else branch we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c_2|\!\} \circ \mathrm{grd}_{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\quad \supseteq \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c_2|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \circ \mathrm{grd}_{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\quad \supseteq \{\!|c_2|\!\}^\sharp \circ \lambda\Delta. \begin{cases} \mathcal{L} & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \Delta & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
&\quad = \begin{cases} \mathcal{L} & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

3.3 – Finally, we merge both approximations of the then-branch and the else-branch:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\quad \supseteq \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \mathrm{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \cap \\
&\qquad\quad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!|c_2|\!\} \circ \mathrm{grd}_{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\quad \supseteq (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \cup \{\mathbb{B}b\}) \cap \begin{cases} \mathcal{L} & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
&\quad = \begin{cases} (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \cup \{\mathbb{B}b\}) & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
&\quad \triangleq \text{(when } [\![b]\!]\sigma = true\text{)} \\
&\qquad (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta
\end{aligned}$$

The case where $[\![b]\!]\sigma = false$ is symmetric.

4 – Case: sequences.

Let $\sigma_1 = [\![c_1]\!]\sigma$ and $\sigma_2 = [\![c_2]\!]\sigma_1$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_{\sigma_2} \circ (\!|c_1; c_2|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\quad = \alpha_{\sigma_2} \circ (\!|c_2|\!)_{\sigma_1} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\quad \supseteq (\gamma_{\sigma_1} \circ \alpha_{\sigma_1} \text{ is extensive}) \\
&\quad\quad \alpha_{\sigma_2} \circ (\!|c_2|\!)_{\sigma_1} \circ \gamma_{\sigma_1} \circ \alpha_{\sigma_1} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\quad \supseteq \text{(By induction hypothesis)} \\
&\quad\quad (\!|c_2|\!)^\sharp_{\sigma_1} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta \\
&\quad \triangleq (\!|c_1; c_2|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta
\end{aligned}$$

5 – Case: assumptions

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_\sigma \circ (\!|\textbf{assume } \Phi|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\quad = \alpha_\sigma \circ \{\tau \in \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \mid \sigma \imath \tau \models \Phi\} \\
&\quad \supseteq \Delta \cup \{\Phi\} \\
&\quad \triangleq (\!|\textbf{assume } \Phi|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta
\end{aligned}$$

6 – Case: assertions

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_\sigma \circ (\!|\textbf{assert } \Phi|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\
&\quad = \alpha_\sigma \circ \begin{cases} \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) & \text{if } \forall \tau \in \gamma_\sigma(\Delta), \sigma \imath \tau \models \Phi \\ \lightning & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
&\quad \supseteq \begin{cases} \Delta \cup \{\Phi\} & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \Phi \\ \lightning & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

7 – Case: loops

$$(\!|\textbf{while } (e) \textbf{ do } c|\!)_\sigma \Sigma \triangleq \mathrm{snd}\left((\mathrm{lfp}^{\preccurlyeq \times \dot{\subseteq}}_{\lambda(\sigma,\Sigma).(\bot,\emptyset)} \mathcal{G})(\sigma, \Sigma)\right)$$

with:

$$\mathcal{G}(w) \triangleq \lambda(\sigma, \Sigma).$$
$$\begin{cases} \sigma, \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\}\Sigma & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w\,([\![c]\!]\sigma, (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)_\sigma \Sigma) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{C} &\triangleq \mathrm{States} \times \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathrm{States}) \cup \{(\bot, \emptyset), (\top, \lightning)\} \\
\mathscr{A} &\triangleq \mathrm{States} \times \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \cup \{(\bot, \mathcal{L}), (\top, \lightning)\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\alpha^\triangleright \in \mathscr{C} \to \mathscr{A}$$
$$\alpha^\triangleright(\sigma, \Sigma) \triangleq \begin{cases} \bot, \mathcal{L} & \text{if } \sigma, \Sigma = \bot, \emptyset \\ \top, \lightning & \text{if } \sigma, \Sigma = \top, \lightning \\ \sigma, \alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\gamma^\triangleright \in \mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{C}$$
$$\gamma^\triangleright(\sigma, \Delta) \triangleq \begin{cases} \bot, \emptyset & \text{if } \sigma, \Delta = \bot, \mathcal{L} \\ \top, \lightning & \text{if } \sigma, \Delta = \top, \lightning \\ \sigma, \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

1 – First, we prove that $(\alpha^{\triangleright}, \gamma^{\triangleright})$ is a Galois connection:

$$(\mathscr{C}; \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq) \underset{\alpha^{\triangleright}}{\overset{\gamma^{\triangleright}}{\leftrightarrows}} (\mathscr{A}; \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp})$$

Let $(\sigma, \Sigma) \in \mathscr{C}$, and $(\sigma', \Delta) \in \mathscr{A}$.

1.1 – Assume $\alpha^{\triangleright}(\sigma, \Sigma) \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} (\sigma', \Delta)$.

Prove $(\sigma, \Sigma) \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\triangleright}(\sigma', \Delta)$.

If $(\sigma, \Sigma) = (\bot, \emptyset)$, then it holds that $(\sigma, \Sigma) \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\triangleright}(\sigma', \Delta)$.

Otherwise, if $(\sigma, \Sigma) = (\top, \lightning)$, then $(\sigma', \Delta) = (\top, \lightning)$, and it holds that $(\sigma, \Sigma) \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\triangleright}(\sigma', \Delta)$.

Otherwise, if $(\sigma, \Sigma) \in \mathrm{States} \times \mathcal{P}_{\lightning}(\mathrm{States})$, then either $\sigma = \sigma'$, or $\sigma' = \top$. If $\sigma' = \mathit{top}$, then $\Delta = \lightning$ and it holds that $(\sigma, \Sigma) \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\triangleright}(\sigma', \Delta)$. If $\sigma = \sigma'$, then $\alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) \supseteq \Delta \implies \Sigma \sqsubseteq \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$ since $(\alpha_\sigma, \gamma_\sigma)$ is a Galois connection. Therefore, it also holds that $(\sigma, \Sigma) \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\triangleright}(\sigma', \Delta)$.

1.2 – Assume $(\sigma, \Sigma) \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq \gamma^{\triangleright}(\sigma', \Delta)$.

Prove $\alpha^{\triangleright}(\sigma, \Sigma) \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} (\sigma', \Delta)$.

If $(\sigma', \Delta) = (\bot, \mathcal{L})$, then $(\sigma, \Sigma) = (\bot, \emptyset)$, thus it holds that $\alpha^{\triangleright}(\sigma, \Sigma) \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} (\sigma', \Delta)$.

Otherwise, if $(\sigma', \Delta) = (\top, \lightning)$, then it holds that $\alpha^{\triangleright}(\sigma, \Sigma) \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} (\sigma', \Delta)$.

Otherwise, if $(\sigma', \Delta) \in \mathrm{States} \times \mathcal{P}_{\lightning}(\mathcal{L})$, then $\sigma \preccurlyeq \sigma'$ implies that either $\sigma = \bot$, or $\sigma = \sigma'$. If $\sigma = \bot$, then $\Sigma = \emptyset$ and it holds that $\alpha^{\triangleright}(\sigma, \Sigma) \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} (\sigma', \Delta)$. If $\sigma = \sigma'$, then $\Sigma \sqsubseteq \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \implies \alpha_\sigma(\Sigma) \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} \Delta$ since $(\alpha_\sigma, \gamma_\sigma)$ is a Galois connection. Therefore, it holds that: $\alpha^{\triangleright}(\sigma, \Sigma) \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} (\sigma', \Delta)$.

2 – Approximating the fixpoint $\mathrm{lfp}^{\dot{\preccurlyeq} \times \dot{\sqsubseteq}}_{\lambda(\sigma,\Sigma).(\bot,\emptyset)} \mathcal{G} \circ \gamma^{\triangleright}(\sigma, \Delta)$.

2.1 – Applying the fixpoint transfer theorem:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha^{\triangleright} \circ (\mathrm{lfp}^{\dot{\preccurlyeq} \times \dot{\sqsubseteq}}_{\lambda(\sigma,\Sigma).(\bot,\emptyset)} \mathcal{G}) \circ \gamma^{\triangleright}(\sigma, \Delta) \\
&\quad \preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} \text{ (assuming } \mathcal{G}^{\sharp} \text{ is a sound approximating of } \mathcal{G}) \\
&\quad (\mathrm{lfp}^{\dot{\preccurlyeq} \times \dot{\sqsubseteq}^{\sharp}}_{\lambda(\sigma,\Delta).(\bot,\mathcal{L})} \mathcal{G}^{\sharp})(\sigma, \Delta)
\end{aligned}$$

2.2 – Deriving a sound approximation of $\mathcal{G}^{\sharp}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha^{\triangleright} \circ \mathcal{G}(w) \circ \gamma^{\triangleright}(\sigma, \Delta) \\
&= \alpha^{\triangleright} \circ \begin{cases} \sigma, \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\}\gamma_\sigma(\Delta) & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w\big([\![c]\!]\sigma, \\ \quad (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\big) & \text{oth.} \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \sigma, \alpha_\sigma \circ \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ \alpha^{\triangleright} \circ w\big([\![c]\!]\sigma, \\ \quad (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\big) & \text{oth.} \end{cases} \\
&\preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} \begin{cases} \sigma, \alpha_\sigma \circ \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ \alpha^{\triangleright} \circ w \circ \gamma^{\triangleright} \circ \alpha^{\triangleright} \circ \big([\![c]\!]\sigma, \\ \quad (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\big) & \text{oth.} \end{cases} \\
&\preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} \begin{cases} \sigma, \alpha_\sigma \circ \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ \alpha^{\triangleright} \circ w \circ \gamma^{\triangleright} \circ \big([\![c]\!]\sigma, \\ \quad \alpha_{[\![c]\!]\sigma} \circ (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)_\sigma \circ \\ \qquad \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\big) & \text{oth.} \end{cases} \\
&\preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} \begin{cases} \sigma, \alpha_\sigma \circ \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w^{\sharp} \circ \big([\![c]\!]\sigma, \\ \quad \alpha_{[\![c]\!]\sigma} \circ (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)_\sigma \circ \\ \qquad \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\big) & \text{oth.} \end{cases} \\
&\preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} \begin{cases} \sigma, \alpha_\sigma \circ \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w^{\sharp} \circ \big([\![c]\!]\sigma, \\ \quad (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)^{\sharp}_\sigma \Delta\big) & \text{oth.} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

(Notice that the derivation above is still generic.)

(Specialising it with the abstract static semantics now.)

$$\preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} \begin{cases} \sigma, \lightning & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \wedge \Delta = \lightning \\ \sigma, \Delta \cup \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \wedge (\Delta \Rightarrow^{\sharp} \mathbb{A}b) \\ \sigma, \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{otherwise if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w^{\sharp} \circ \big([\![c]\!]\sigma, \\ \ (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)^{\sharp}_\sigma \Delta\big) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

3 – Finally,

$$(\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!)^{\sharp}_\sigma \Delta \triangleq \mathrm{snd}(\mathrm{lfp}^{\dot{\preccurlyeq} \times \dot{\sqsubseteq}^{\sharp}}_{\lambda(\sigma,\Delta).(\bot,\mathcal{L})} \mathcal{G}^{\sharp})(\sigma, \Delta)$$

with:

$$\mathcal{G}^{\sharp} \triangleq \lambda w^{\sharp}.\lambda(\sigma, \Delta).\begin{cases} \sigma, \lightning & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \wedge \Delta = \lightning \\ \sigma, \Delta \cup \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \wedge (\Delta \Rightarrow^{\sharp} \mathbb{A}b) \\ \sigma, \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{otherwise if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w^{\sharp} \circ \big([\![c]\!]\sigma, \\ \ (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)^{\sharp}_\sigma \Delta\big) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

### F-B Hybrid Monitor with the Modified Variables

We start by first proving an intermediate result, introduced in Lemma 11. We denote by $\sigma_V$ the restriction of the state $\sigma$ to the set $V$ of variables. Lemma 11

**Lemma 11 .** $\forall \sigma, \tau, \tau' \in \text{States}, \forall \Phi \in \mathcal{L}, \forall V \subseteq Var$, if:

1) $\sigma \imath \tau \models \Phi$
2) $\tau_V = \tau'_V$
3) $\text{fv}(\Phi) \subseteq V$

then,

$$\sigma \imath \tau' \models \Phi$$

*Proof.* The proof of this lemma is straightforward, by structural induction on relational formulas as well as a structural induction on expressions, by remarking that $\forall e \in Exp, (\text{fv}(e) \subseteq V \implies [\![e]\!]\tau = [\![e]\!]\tau')$.

**Lemma 6 soundness of $\mathcal{M}\{\!\{-\}\!\}^\sharp_-$ .** For all $c, c', \sigma, \sigma'$ such that $\sigma' = [\![c']\!]\sigma$, it holds that: $\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!\{c\}\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma \dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp \mathcal{M}\{\!\{c\}\!\}^\sharp_{c'}$.

with $\mathcal{M}\{\!\{c\}\!\}^\sharp_{c'}$ defined as:

$$\mathcal{M}\{\!\{c\}\!\}^\sharp_{c'} \in \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L}) \to \mathcal{P}_\lightning(\mathcal{L})$$

$$\mathcal{M}\{\!\{c\}\!\}^\sharp_{c'}\Delta \triangleq \begin{cases} \lightning & \text{if } \Delta = \lightning \\ \mathcal{L} & \text{if } \Delta = \mathcal{L} \\ \{\Phi \in \Delta \mid \forall id \in \text{fv}(\Phi), & \\ \quad id \notin \text{Mod}(c) \cup \text{Mod}(c')\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.*

Let a command $\subset'$ and $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{States}$ such that $\sigma' = [\![c']\!]\sigma$. Then:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!\{c\}\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\mathcal{L}) = \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!\{c\}\!\}\emptyset = \alpha_{\sigma'}(\emptyset) = \mathcal{L}$$

Also,

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!\{c\}\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\lightning) = \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!\{c\}\!\}\lightning = \alpha_{\sigma'}(\lightning) = \lightning$$

Additionally, assuming $\Delta \neq \mathcal{L}$ and $\Delta \neq \lightning$:

$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!\{c\}\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$

(By monotonicity of $\alpha_{\sigma'}$, and $\gamma_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma$ being extensive)

$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \gamma_\sigma \circ \alpha_\sigma \circ \{\!\{c\}\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$

$\sqsubseteq^\sharp$ (By applying Lemma 11, since for all $\tau \in \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$, for all $\tau'$ such that $\tau' = [\![c]\!]\tau, \tau' =_{Var \setminus \text{Mod}(c)} \tau$)

$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\{\Phi \in \Delta \mid \text{fv}(\Phi) \cap \text{Mod}(c) = \emptyset\})$

$\sqsubseteq^\sharp$ (By applying Lemma 11, since for all $\sigma, \sigma'$ such that $\sigma' = [\![c']\!]\sigma$, $\sigma' =_{Var \setminus \text{Mod}(c')} \sigma$, and by defining $\Delta'$ as $\Delta' \triangleq \{\Phi \in \Delta \mid \text{fv}(\Phi) \cap \text{Mod}(c) = \emptyset\})$

$\{\Phi \in \Delta' \mid \text{fv}(\Phi) \cap \text{Mod}(c') = \emptyset\}$

$= \{\Phi \in \Delta \mid \text{fv}(\Phi) \cap (\text{Mod}(c) \cup \text{Mod}(c')) = \emptyset\}$

$\triangleq \mathcal{M}\{\!\{c\}\!\}^\sharp_{c'}\Delta \quad \square$

**Theorem 3 soundness of $\mathcal{M}(\!|-|\!)^\sharp_-$ .** The hybrid monitor $\mathcal{M}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma$ is sound in the sense of Equation (4): for all $c, \sigma$:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma \dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp \mathcal{M}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \quad \text{where } \sigma' = [\![c]\!]\sigma$$

*Proof.*

Let $\Sigma \in States$ and $\Delta \in \mathcal{L}$. Let us derive a hybrid monitoring semantics relying on a static analysis over-approximating the set of variables that may be modified by a command $\subset$. We will consider only the case of branching instructions, since the derivation of the abstract monitoring semantics of the other commands is similar to the one in Theorem 2.

1 – Case : conditionals

Let $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{States}$ such that $\sigma' = [\![\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2]\!]\sigma$. Let us also assume that $[\![b]\!]\sigma = true$, which means that $\sigma' = [\![c_1]\!]\sigma$. Then, similarly to Theorem 3 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\ &= \alpha_{\sigma'}\big((\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \text{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \cup \\ &\qquad \{\!\{c_2\}\!\} \circ \text{grd}_{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\big) \\ &= \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \text{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \cap \\ &\qquad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!\{c_2\}\!\} \circ \text{grd}_{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \end{aligned}$$

as well as:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \text{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \sqsubseteq^\sharp (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \cup \{\mathbb{B}b\}).$$

As for the non-executed branch, we have a more precise abstract static semantics by Lemma 6:

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!\{c_2\}\!\} \circ \text{grd}_{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\ &\sqsubseteq^\sharp \begin{cases} \mathcal{L} & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \{\Phi \in \Delta \mid \forall id \in \text{fv}(\Phi), & \\ \quad id \notin \text{Mod}(c_1) \cup \text{Mod}(c_2)\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2|\!)_\sigma \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\ &\sqsubseteq^\sharp \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ (\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma \circ \text{grd}_b \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \cap \\ &\qquad \alpha_{\sigma'} \circ \{\!\{c_2\}\!\} \circ \text{grd}_{\neg b} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) \\ &\sqsubseteq^\sharp (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \cup \{\mathbb{B}b\}) \cap \\ &\qquad \begin{cases} \mathcal{L} & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ \{\Phi \in \Delta \mid \forall id \in \text{fv}(\Phi), & \\ \quad id \notin \text{Mod}(c_1) \cup \text{Mod}(c_2)\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \cup \{\mathbb{B}b\}) & \text{if } \Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b \\ (\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta \cup \{\mathbb{B}b\}) \cap & \\ \{\Phi \in \Delta \mid \text{fv}(\Phi) \cap (\text{Mod}(c_1) \cup \text{Mod}(c_2)) = \emptyset\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

2 – Case: loops

We rely on the generic derivation of loops in Theorem 2, and specialize it with the static analysis relying on the modified variables.

Therefore, we continue the derivation from the generic approximation obtained in Theorem 2:

$\alpha^{\triangleright} \circ \mathcal{G}(w) \circ \gamma^{\triangleright}(\sigma, \Delta)$

$$\preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} \begin{cases} \sigma, \alpha_\sigma \circ \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta) & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w^{\sharp} \circ \big([\![c]\!]\sigma, \\ \quad (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)^{\sharp}_{\sigma}\Delta\big) \text{ oth.} \end{cases}$$

$$\preccurlyeq \times \sqsubseteq^{\sharp} \begin{cases} \sigma, \lightning & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \wedge \Delta = \lightning \\ \sigma, \Delta \cup \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \wedge (\Delta \Rightarrow^{\sharp} \mathbb{A}b) \\ \sigma, \big(\{\Phi \in \Delta \mid \mathrm{fv}(\Phi) \cap \mathrm{Mod}(c) = \emptyset\} \cap \\ \qquad \Delta\big) \cup \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{otherwise if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w^{\sharp} \circ \big([\![c]\!]\sigma, \\ (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)^{\sharp}_{\sigma}\Delta\big) & \text{otherw.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore:

$$(\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!)^{\sharp}_{\sigma}\Delta \triangleq \mathrm{snd}\left((\mathrm{lfp}^{\dot{\preccurlyeq}\times\dot{\sqsubseteq}^{\sharp}}_{\lambda(\sigma,\Delta).(\bot,\mathcal{L})}\, \mathcal{G}^{\sharp})(\sigma, \Delta)\right)$$

with:

$$\mathcal{G}^{\sharp} \triangleq \lambda w^{\sharp}.\lambda(\sigma, \Delta).$$

$$\begin{cases} \sigma, \lightning & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \wedge \Delta = \lightning \\ \sigma, \Delta \cup \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \wedge (\Delta \Rightarrow^{\sharp} \mathbb{A}b) \\ \sigma, \big(\{\Phi \in \Delta \mid \mathrm{fv}(\Phi) \cap \mathrm{Mod}(c) = \emptyset\} \cap \\ \qquad \Delta\big) \cup \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{otherwise if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w^{\sharp} \circ \big([\![c]\!]\sigma, \\ (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)^{\sharp}_{\sigma}\Delta\big) & \text{otherw.} \end{cases}$$

### F-C Hybrid Monitor with Intervals

The abstract semantics of an interval analysis, inspired by [39], is presented in Figure 7.

$$\mathrm{grd}_b^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\lightning) \triangleq \lightning$$

$$\mathrm{blw}([a,b]) \triangleq [-\infty, b] \qquad \mathrm{abv}([a,b]) \triangleq [a, +\infty]$$

$$\mathrm{grd}_{e_1 \leq e_2}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \triangleq \mathrm{app}_{e_1}^{\mathrm{blw}(\imath(e_2))}(\imath) \sqcap^\sharp \mathrm{app}_{e_2}^{\mathrm{abv}(\imath(e_1))}(\imath)$$

$$\mathrm{grd}_{e_1 < e_2}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \triangleq \mathrm{app}_{e_1}^{\mathrm{blw}(\imath(e_2)-1)}(\imath) \sqcap^\sharp \mathrm{app}_{e_2}^{\mathrm{abv}(\imath(e_1)+1)}(\imath)$$

$$\mathrm{grd}_{e_1 = e_2}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \triangleq \mathrm{app}_{e_1}^{\imath(e_2)}(\imath) \sqcap^\sharp \mathrm{app}_{e_2}^{\imath(e_1)}(\imath)$$

$$\mathrm{grd}_{\neg(e_1=e_2)}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \triangleq \mathrm{grd}_{(e_1<e_2)\wedge(e_2>e_1)}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \triangleq \mathrm{grd}_{b_1 \wedge b_2}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \triangleq$$

$$\mathrm{grd}_{b_1}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \sqcap^\sharp \mathrm{grd}_{b_2}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\imath)$$

$$\mathrm{grd}_{b_1 \vee b_2}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \triangleq \mathrm{grd}_{b_1}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \sqcup^\sharp \mathrm{grd}_{b_2}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\imath)$$

---

$$\mathrm{app}_x^i(\imath) \triangleq \imath[x \mapsto \imath(x) \sqcap^\sharp i]$$

$$\mathrm{app}_{e_1+e_2}^i(\imath) \triangleq \mathrm{app}_{e_1}^{i-\imath(e_2)}(\imath) \sqcap^\sharp \mathrm{app}_{e_2}^{i-\imath(e_1)}(\imath)$$

$$\mathrm{app}_{e_1-e_2}^i(\imath) \triangleq \mathrm{app}_{e_1}^{i+\imath(e_2)}(\imath) \sqcap^\sharp \mathrm{app}_{e_2}^{\imath(e_1)-i}(\imath)$$

$$\mathrm{app}_n^i(\imath) \triangleq \top^{\mathrm{Int}}$$

---

$$\imath(n) \triangleq [n,n] \qquad \imath(e_1 + e_2) \triangleq \imath(e_1) + \imath(e_2)$$

$$\imath(e_1 - e_2) \triangleq \imath(e_1) - \imath(e_2)$$

---

$$\{\!|c|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \lightning \triangleq \lightning \qquad \{\!|\textbf{skip}|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\imath \triangleq \imath$$

$$\{\!|c_1; c_2|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\imath \triangleq \{\!|c_2|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \circ \{\!|c_1|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\imath$$

$$\{\!|id := e|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\imath \triangleq \imath[id \mapsto \imath(e)] \qquad \{\!|\textbf{assume } \Phi|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\imath \triangleq \imath$$

$$\{\!|\textbf{assert } \Phi|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\imath \triangleq \imath \qquad \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\imath \triangleq$$

$$\{\!|c_1|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \circ \mathrm{grd}_b^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \sqcup^\sharp \{\!|c_2|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \circ \mathrm{grd}_{\neg b}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}(\imath)$$

$$\{\!|\textbf{while } (e)\ c|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\imath \triangleq$$

$$\mathrm{grd}_{\neg b}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\left(\mathrm{lfp}_{\imath}^{\sqsubseteq^\sharp} \{\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else skip}|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\right)$$

Figure 7. Abstract semantics of an interval analysis

**Lemma 7 .** For all $\sigma \in \mathrm{States}$, any pair of operators that is a Granger's reduced product $(\mathrm{toint}_\sigma, \mathrm{tofor}_\sigma)$ for the Cartesian abstraction $\mathrm{States}_{\lightning}^{\mathrm{Int}} \times \mathcal{P}_{\lightning}(\mathcal{L})$ provides a sound approximation of the interface between intervals and relational formulas:

$$\alpha^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \gamma_\sigma \dot{\leq}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \lambda\Delta.\, \mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\lightning, \Delta) \text{ and}$$
$$\alpha_\sigma \circ \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}} \dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp \lambda\imath.\, \mathrm{tofor}_\sigma(\imath, \lightning)$$

*Proof.*
Let $\Delta \in \mathcal{P}_{\lightning}(\mathcal{L})$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\\
&= \alpha^{\mathrm{Int}}\left(\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\lightning) \cap \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\right)\\
&= \text{(By definition of } \gamma_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}})\\
&\quad \alpha^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \gamma_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\lightning, \Delta)\\
&= \text{(By the soundness condition of a Granger's pair)}\\
&\quad \alpha^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \gamma_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}}\left(\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\lightning, \Delta), \Delta\right)\\
&= \text{(By definition of } \alpha_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}})\\
&\quad \mathrm{fst}\, \alpha_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \gamma_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}}\left(\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\lightning, \Delta), \Delta\right)\\
&\leq^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \text{(Since } \alpha_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \gamma_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}} \text{ is reductive)}\\
&\quad \mathrm{fst}\left(\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\lightning, \Delta), \Delta\right)\\
&= \mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\lightning, \Delta)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, let $\imath \in \mathrm{States}^{\mathrm{Int}}$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_\sigma \circ \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) &= \alpha_\sigma\left(\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \cap \gamma_\sigma(\lightning)\right)\\
&= \mathrm{snd}\, \alpha_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \gamma_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath, \lightning)\\
&= \mathrm{snd}\, \alpha_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}} \circ \gamma_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath, \mathrm{tofor}_\sigma(\imath, \lightning))\\
&\sqsubseteq^\sharp \mathrm{tofor}_\sigma(\imath, \lightning) \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 8 .** For all $\sigma \in \mathrm{States}$, the pair of operators $\mathrm{toint}_\sigma, \mathrm{tofor}_\sigma$ is a Granger's reduced product.

*Proof.*
The error cases are straightforward: $\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\imath, \lightning) \triangleq \imath$ and $\mathrm{tofor}_\sigma(\lightning, \Delta) \triangleq \Delta$.
Let us restrict ourselves to $\imath \in \mathrm{States}^{\mathrm{Int}}$ and $\Delta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L})$.
1 – $\mathrm{toint}_\sigma$ is sound.
1.1 – Case : $\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\imath, \Delta)$.
We will prove that:

$$\gamma_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}}\left(\bigsqcap_{\Phi\in\Delta}^\sharp \mathrm{toint}_\sigma\left(\imath, \{\Phi\}\right), \Delta\right) = \gamma_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath, \Delta)$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gamma_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath, \Delta)\\
&= \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \cap \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\\
&= (\Delta \text{ is interpreted conjunctively by } \gamma_\sigma)\\
&\quad \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \bigcap_{\Phi\in\Delta} \gamma_\sigma\left(\{\Phi\}\right)\\
&= \bigcap_{\Phi\in\Delta} \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath) \bigcap_{\Phi\in\Delta} \gamma_\sigma\left(\{\Phi\}\right)\\
&= \bigcap_{\Phi\in\Delta} \gamma_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}}\left(\imath, \{\Phi\}\right)\\
&= \text{(By cases 1.2 and 1.3, proven below)}\\
&\quad \bigcap_{\Phi\in\Delta} \gamma_\sigma^{\mathrm{Int}}\left(\mathrm{toint}_\sigma\left(\imath, \{\Phi\}\right), \{\Phi\}\right)\\
&= \bigcap_{\Phi\in\Delta} \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}\left(\mathrm{toint}_\sigma\left(\imath, \{\Phi\}\right)\right) \bigcap_{\Phi\in\Delta} \gamma_\sigma(\{\Phi\})\\
&= (\Delta \text{ is interpreted conjunctively by } \gamma_\sigma)\\
&\quad \bigcap_{\Phi\in\Delta} \gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}\left(\mathrm{toint}_\sigma\left(\imath, \{\Phi\}\right)\right) \cap \gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\\
&= (\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}} \text{ is multiplicative})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}\left(\bigsqcap^{\sharp}_{\Phi\in\Delta}\mathrm{toint}_\sigma\left(\imath,\{\Phi\}\right)\right)\cap\gamma_\sigma(\Delta)$$
$$=\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma\left(\bigsqcap^{\sharp}_{\Phi\in\Delta}\mathrm{toint}_\sigma\left(\imath,\{\Phi\}\right),\Delta\right)$$
$$\triangleq\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma\left(\mathrm{toint}(\imath,\Delta),\Delta\right)$$
$$\text{with }\ \mathrm{toint}(\imath,\Delta)\triangleq\bigsqcap^{\sharp}_{\Phi\in\Delta}\mathrm{toint}_\sigma\left(\imath,\{\Phi\}\right)$$

1.2 – Case : $\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\imath,\{\mathbb{A}e\})$

$$\begin{aligned}&\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma\left(\imath,\{\mathbb{A}e\}\right)\\&=\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath)\cap\gamma_\sigma(\{\mathbb{A}e\})\\&=\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath)\cap\{\tau\in\mathrm{States}\mid\sigma\imath\tau\models\mathbb{A}e\}\\&=\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath)\cap\{\tau\in\mathrm{States}\mid[\![e]\!]\tau=[\![e]\!]\sigma\}\\&=\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath)\cap\mathrm{grd}^{e=[\![e]\!]\sigma}(\mathrm{States})\\&=\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath)\cap\mathrm{grd}^{e=[\![e]\!]\sigma}\circ\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath)\\&=(\text{By soundness of }\mathrm{grd}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_{e=[\![e]\!]\sigma})\\&\quad\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}(\imath)\cap\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}\circ\mathrm{grd}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_{e=[\![e]\!]\sigma}(\imath)\cap\gamma_\sigma(\{\mathbb{A}e\})\\&=\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}\left(\imath\sqcap^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\mathrm{grd}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_{e=[\![e]\!]\sigma}(\imath)\right)\cap\gamma_\sigma(\{\mathbb{A}e\})\\&=\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma\left(\imath\sqcap^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\mathrm{grd}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_{e=[\![e]\!]\sigma}(\imath),\{\mathbb{A}e\}\right)\end{aligned}$$

1.3 – Case: $\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\imath,\{\mathbb{B}b\})$
Similarly to case 1.2, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}&\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma\left(\imath,\{\mathbb{B}e\}\right)\\&=\gamma^{\mathrm{Int}}_\sigma\left(\imath\sqcap^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\mathrm{grd}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_b(\imath),\{\mathbb{B}b\}\right)\quad\square\end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 4 .** The abstract monitoring semantics $\mathcal{I}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma$ of the hybrid monitor, introduced in Figure 4, is sound: For all $\sigma,\sigma'\in\mathrm{States}$ such that $\sigma'=[\![c]\!]\sigma$, it holds that:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'}\circ(\!|c|\!)_\sigma\circ\gamma_\sigma\mathrel{\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp}\mathcal{I}(\!|c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma$$

*Proof.*
Let $\Sigma\in States$ and $\Delta\in\mathcal{L}$. Let us derive a hybrid monitoring semantics relying on an interval static analysis. We will consider only the case of branching instructions, since the derivation of the abstract monitoring semantics of the other commands is similar to the one in Theorem 2.
1 – Case : conditionals
Let $\sigma,\sigma'\in\mathrm{States}$ such that $\sigma'=[\![\textbf{if }b\textbf{ then }c_1\textbf{ else }c_2]\!]\sigma$. Let us also assume that $[\![b]\!]\sigma=true$. Then, similarly to Theorem 3 we have:

$$\begin{aligned}&\alpha_{\sigma'}\circ(\!|\textbf{if }b\textbf{ then }c_1\textbf{ else }c_2|\!)_\sigma\circ\gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\\&\quad=\alpha_{\sigma'}\circ(\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma\circ\mathrm{grd}_b\circ\gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\cap\\&\qquad\alpha_{\sigma'}\circ\{\!|c_2|\!\}\circ\mathrm{grd}_{\neg b}\circ\gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\end{aligned}$$

as well as:

$$\alpha_{\sigma'}\circ(\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma\circ\mathrm{grd}_b\circ\gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\sqsubseteq^\sharp(\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta\cup\{\mathbb{B}b\}).$$

As for the non-executed branch, we have a more precise abstract static semantics by Lemma 9:

$$\begin{aligned}&\alpha_{\sigma'}\circ\{\!|c_2|\!\}\circ\mathrm{grd}_{\neg b}\circ\gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\\&\sqsubseteq^\sharp\begin{cases}\lightning&\text{if }\Delta=\lightning\\\mathcal{L}&\text{if }\Delta\Rightarrow^\sharp\mathbb{A}b\\\lambda\imath.\,\mathrm{tofor}_{\sigma'}(\imath,\emptyset)\circ\{\!|c_2|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\circ\mathrm{grd}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_{\neg b}\circ\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\top^{\mathrm{Int}},\Delta)&\text{oth.}\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}&\alpha_{\sigma'}\circ(\!|\textbf{if }b\textbf{ then }c_1\textbf{ else }c_2|\!)_\sigma\circ\gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\\&\quad\sqsubseteq^\sharp\alpha_{\sigma'}\circ(\!|c_1|\!)_\sigma\circ\mathrm{grd}_b\circ\gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\cap\\&\qquad\alpha_{\sigma'}\circ\{\!|c_2|\!\}\circ\mathrm{grd}_{\neg b}\circ\gamma_\sigma(\Delta)\\&\quad\sqsubseteq^\sharp(\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta\cup\{\mathbb{B}b\})\cap\\&\qquad\begin{cases}\mathcal{L}&\text{if }\Delta\Rightarrow^\sharp\mathbb{A}b\\\lambda\imath.\,\mathrm{tofor}_{\sigma'}(\imath,\emptyset)\circ\{\!|c_2|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\circ\\\quad\mathrm{grd}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_{\neg b}\circ\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\top^{\mathrm{Int}},\Delta)&\text{otherwise}\end{cases}\\&\quad\sqsubseteq^\sharp\begin{cases}(\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta\cup\{\mathbb{B}b\})&\text{if }\Delta\Rightarrow^\sharp\mathbb{A}b\\(\!|c_1|\!)^\sharp_\sigma(\Delta\cup\{\mathbb{B}b\})\cap\\\quad\lambda\imath.\,\mathrm{tofor}_{\sigma'}(\imath,\emptyset)\circ\{\!|c_2|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\circ\\\qquad\mathrm{grd}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}_{\neg b}\circ\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\top^{\mathrm{Int}},\Delta)&\text{otherwise}\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

2 – Case : loops
We rely on the generic derivation of loops in Theorem 2, and specialize it with the static analysis relying on the modified variables.

Therefore, we continue the derivation from the generic approximation obtained in Theorem 2:

$$\begin{aligned}&\alpha^\triangleright\circ\mathcal{G}(w)\circ\gamma^\triangleright(\sigma,\Delta)\\&\preccurlyeq\times\sqsubseteq^\sharp\begin{cases}\sigma,\alpha_\sigma\circ\{\!|\textbf{while }b\textbf{ do }c|\!\}\circ\gamma_\sigma(\Delta)&\text{if }\neg[\![b]\!]\sigma\\w^\sharp\circ\left([\![c]\!]\sigma,\right.\\\quad\left.(\!|\textbf{if }b\textbf{ then }c\textbf{ else skip}|\!)^\sharp_\sigma\Delta\right)&\text{oth.}\end{cases}\\&\preccurlyeq\times\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp\\&\begin{cases}\sigma,\lightning&\text{if }\neg[\![b]\!]\sigma\wedge\Delta=\lightning\\\sigma,\Delta\cup\{\mathbb{B}\neg b\}&\text{if }\neg[\![b]\!]\sigma\wedge(\Delta\Rightarrow^\sharp\mathbb{A}b)\\\sigma,\left(\lambda\imath.\,\mathrm{tofor}_\sigma(\imath,\emptyset)\circ\{\!|\textbf{while }b\textbf{ do }c|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}}\circ\right.\\\qquad\left.\mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\top^{\mathrm{Int}},\Delta)\cap\Delta\right)\cup\{\mathbb{B}\neg b\}&\text{otherw. if }\neg[\![b]\!]\sigma\\w^\sharp\circ\left([\![c]\!]\sigma,\right.\\\left.(\!|\textbf{if }b\textbf{ then }c\textbf{ else skip}|\!)^\sharp_\sigma\Delta\right)&\text{otherw.}\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$(\!|\textbf{while }b\textbf{ do }c|\!)^\sharp_\sigma\Delta\triangleq\mathrm{snd}\left((\mathrm{lfp}^{\dot{\preccurlyeq}\times\dot{\sqsubseteq}^\sharp}_{\lambda(\sigma,\Delta).(\bot,\mathcal{L})}\mathcal{G}^\sharp)(\sigma,\Delta)\right)$$

with:

$\mathcal{G}^\sharp \triangleq \lambda w^\sharp.\lambda(\sigma,\Delta).$

$$\begin{cases} \sigma, \lightning & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \wedge \Delta = \lightning \\ \sigma, \Delta \cup \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \wedge (\Delta \Rightarrow^\sharp \mathbb{A}b) \\ \sigma, \big(\lambda\imath.\, \mathrm{tofor}_\sigma(\imath,\emptyset) \circ \{\!|\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c|\!\}^{\sharp,\mathrm{Int}} \circ \\ \qquad \mathrm{toint}_\sigma(\top^{\mathrm{Int}},\Delta) \cap \Delta\big) \cup \{\mathbb{B}\neg b\} & \text{otherwise if } \neg[\![b]\!]\sigma \\ w^\sharp \circ \big([\![c]\!]\sigma, \\ \quad (\!|\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c \textbf{ else skip}|\!)^\sharp_\sigma \Delta\big) & \text{otherw.} \end{cases}$$